Vol I of this magazine was published under the title The Religious Cabinet.

Library of

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON MASS.

THE

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC MAGAZINE.

APRIL, 1843.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

READ BEFORE THE CARROLL INSTITUTE OF PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 29, 1842.

BY WILLIAM GEORGE READ, LL.D.

HISTORY instructs and charms us by a varied process; sometimes displaying the general movement of society from barbarism to civilization, or from refinement to decay; sometimes exhibiting individual character, for admiration or contempt, love or detestation, imitation or avoidance.

As the cloudy curtain rolls away, which discloses on her magic glass the long and gorgeous pageant of the mighty Plantagenet succession, majestic phantoms crowd upon our ardent gaze. There the high-born and high-matched Matilda forgets the sovereign in the mother, "withdraws her brows from a crown's enchanting circle," and leaves the well-fought field of British politics to her puissant son. There Barbarossa, maddened by the blazing diadem of empire, rushes from his German throne to crush the undying spirit of Crema and Milan beneath their battered ruins, and subvert, together with Italian liberty, the rock-based chair of Peter. There an Alexander, calmly confiding in his Master's promise, defends

with unwavering firmness, his unsolicited tiara against a frantic schism. There the brave, the generous, the too confiding Louis wages unequal contest with his encroaching vassal, whom policy and valor seem leagued with wayward fortune to exalt to the summit of earthly greatness; while he "of the lion heart," and the fiery Philip Augustus, struggle forward to the stirring scene.

> "Above the rest,
> In shape and gesture proudly eminent,
> Stands like a tower"

one whom the Church has on this day honored with her noblest martyrs for six hundred and sixty-nine years.

In the moral and intellectual, as in the material creation, we meet at distant intervals productions of extraordinary excellence; whether it be that rare combinations of circumstances evolve peculiar energies, or, as I rather think, that the Almighty endows with especial gifts those whom he appoints to important spheres of action. Such was the sainted Thomas of Canterbury.

His very birth announced that he was "not in the roll of common men." Historians agree that his father, Gilbert Becket, whose personal worth and respectable social standing are abundantly proved by his having filled the office of sheriff, or viscount of London, had left his native land, in the fervor of a now forgotten piety, to bow his forehead in the dust that had been wet with the tears and bloody sweat of his Saviour. That his pilgrimage eventuated in his marriage with a Saracenic lady is also certain. The circumstances which led to it, as recorded by the earlier and Catholic writers, though sneered at by modern scepticism, and the prejudice that sees no cause for exultation in the conversion of an infidel to the ancient faith of Christendom, were neither inconsistent with probability, nor the high-wrought enthusiasm of that romantic era, when whole continents, banded under cross or crescent, rushed to battle on the sacred soil of Palestine.

We are told that while praying at some spot consecrated in the history of our redemption, his party were surprised by an ambush of the Saracens, whose gathering strength pressed hard against the falling throne of Godfrey. Gilbert became the property of an emir, whom his probity and intelligence conciliated to especial kindness, and who took such delight in his conversation that he frequently commanded his presence at his table. It may be supposed that the discourse of a stranger from a distant clime, whose pilgrimage must have abounded in wild adventure, and opportunities for much curious observation, would have charms for the ear of beauty, and, accordingly, a daughter of the unsuspecting chieftain would oft, like the gentle Venetian maiden, "seriously incline to hear." Admiring his wisdom and his virtues, and, it may be, touched by a more tender sentiment, she sought at last a private interview, and questioned long the interesting captive. He gratified her curiosity concerning his birth place and travels, and expounded the leading tenets of the Christian faith. As he warmed on the sacred theme, a sympathetic ardor fired the maiden's breast! She avowed a desire to become a Christian, and asked, as she knew no one of that religion but himself, if he would marry her, provided they could escape together from the power of her countrymen. Gilbert, whose affections were fixed on heavenly joys, and who possibly suspected the fair infidel's sincerity, contented himself with expatiating, in general terms, on the happiness of a Christian, and his wish that God would vouchsafe her the grace to become one.

Not long after, he escaped with the companions of his captivity, and returned to England. But his words had lighted up undying hopes in the heart of the slighted lady, where, if aught of human passion mingled, it was like the hallowed flame the Church is wont to kindle at the paschal time. She left her kindred and her father's house,—she gained the Christian territory, and learning there that her apostle had departed for his native land, she embarked with a company of merchants and pilgrims, and followed him to London. As she wandered through the streets, her foreign garb and speech attracting universal attention, she was recognised in the crowd, as she passed his master's house (where a hospi-

tal was subsequently founded in honor of St. Thomas), by Gilbert's servant Richard, who had shared his imprisonment and escape. Gilbert could at first scarce credit the intelligence that the friendless girl could have accomplished so arduous an adventure; but assured at last, he adored the providence of God in her behalf, and being counselled to espouse her by the bishop of London and other prelates there present, who regarded her as a chosen vessel to promote the glory of the Church, he married her on the day of her baptism by the name of Matilda. These were the parents of the venerated subject of my essay.

Special revelations to his mother are believed to have foreshown his future eminence and sanctity. How far an active imagination, stimulated by earnest desire, may have impressed her with such convictions, it were unavailing to enquire, as it would be impossible to ascertain. One conclusion is unquestionable. The pious dispositions and practices of the earthly authors of his being might well procure for him the high vocation they hoped for, and which is, perhaps, attainable by every Christian parent, who would wisely exchange for his offspring a few fleeting years of feverish and often painful worldly excitement, for "an eternal weight of glory." It is certain, too, that the docility, modesty, and piety, of the youthful Thomas, soon gave promise of more abundant spiritual unction, on one whom rare personal beauty, uncommon quickness of perception, and unrivalled tenacity of memory combined with unerring precision of judgment, seemed to designate for a glorious temple of the Holy Ghost.

His father having, with his wife's consent, returned to the holy land, to take part in its defence, shortly after their nuptials, the care of their son, in his infancy and early childhood, devolved exclusively on his mother; and so carefully did she train him in that "fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom," that, while his innocent hilarity tempered with discretion rendered him the delight of his associates, he was accustomed, with premature austerity, to employ the discipline and the hair cloth, to restrain the exuberant vivacity of his youth. On Gilbert's return from the crusade he devoted himself with unremitted assiduity to the religious education of his son; and having placed him at school in a convent, for security to his morals, was so edified by his rapid proficiency in learning and virtue, that, already recognising in him a mighty minister of the Most High, he is said on a certain occasion to have fallen prostrate in reverence before him, to the no small scandal of the superior of the house.

His mother died when he was about twenty-one years old; and his father's fortune having been impaired by casualties, Thomas was compelled to quit Oxford, and seek employment in London, as a clerk or scrivener. At the expiration of a year, however, he resumed his studies at Paris, devoting himself to the law, and such accomplishments as might qualify him for a civil career. Returned to London he engaged in business, with brilliant success; while his faculties became sharpened, and his judgment matured, for the future exigencies of his eventful life.

But humility is the only foundation of enduring greatness; and the future champion of the Church was to learn his own insufficiency, and the overpowering grace of God in his behalf. Flattered by the attention of a young nobleman of fortune, who courted his society, he neglected his affairs, and, yielding himself to the fascinating dissipation of his patron, engaged with characteristic ardor and exclusiveness in sylvan sports. One day his falcon having plunged into a river after a duck, Thomas leaped into the stream, regardless of every thing but the preservation of his bird. The current was rapid and swept him towards a mill! When now his destruction seemed inevitable, the wheel suddenly stopped, arrested in its rapid revolution by some unknown power, while his attendants drew him with difficulty to the shore. This providential preservation recalled him to reflection on his useless, and therefore criminal life. He abandoned it, and returned to the city, and the practice of his profession.

But the hope of earthly fame and fortune could not satisfy the cravings of so great a

heart. The injustice, venality, and chicane, of which he was hourly a witness, the outrages against religion and the rights of the Church, which he saw and resisted, without being able to prevent them, that despairing sense of loneliness with which he stemmed the tide of universal corruption, disgusted and afflicted him; and determining to engage in a better regulated calling, he sought the service of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, who received him with joy, and soon, appreciating his abilities and virtue, admitted him to the closest confidence. Thus associated in the councils of the archdiocess, he soon gave evidence of his decided character. Henry, bishop of Winchester, and brother to the reigning monarch, had been appointed legate for England, and elated thereby, and his near relation to the king, lorded it over the clergy with the most oppressive arrogance. Becket stimulated the archbishop to resistance; and being prompt to execute, as sagacious to advise, undertook a special embassy to the Pope on the subject; which he conducted so ably, that the legantine powers were withdrawn from the bishop, and confirmed on Theobald.

The same energies were called into requisition, by a political transaction of the most vital importance. Stephen, anxious to confirm his dubious title to his son, determined to procure his coronation. The archbishop, prompted by Becket, who represented the fatal consequences to the kingdom of such a proceeding, refused to comply; and his example animated the other prelates to similar resistance. The enraged monarch resorted to the usual appliances of tyranny to compel obedience; and some bishops were weak enough to relax their opposition. But Theobald remained inflexible, and was compelled to fly the realm; while his goods were subjected to confiscation. He was soon, however, recalled, and the project of the coronation abandoned. In this affair, it is conceded that the master spirit was St. Thomas; who thus became, in some sort, the founder of a dynasty, the first reign of which was signalised by a relentless and bloody persecution of himself.

These and similar services, which in a more precipitate, or (as the phrase is) practical age, would at once have commended him to the highest preferments, only increased the anxiety of men, (who, in religion and morals, as in their sacred architecture, built for eternity), that he should receive more thorough academical preparation for the mighty career that was evidently before him. The canonists and civilians of Bologna and Auxerre were, at that time, reputed the ablest in Europe; and, at the suggestion of Theobald, he passed some time under their instruction. Subsequently graced by his patron with several ecclesiastical benefices, and finally promoted to the archdeaconry of Canterbury, he continued to labor in the most important affairs, to the increasing satisfaction of the primate and the public; but, as poor human nature is the same in every station, not without attracting the envy and hatred of Roger his predecessor in the last named office, who had been raised to the see of York.

A more brilliant sphere was opened to his talents and ambition, by the accession of the second Henry. This prince, who belongs to that class of splendid monuments, by which Almighty God sees fit to illustrate, from age to age, the impotence and folly of those who war against his Church, was a compound of the most admirable and the basest qualities. Brave, sagacious, temperate, active, and indefatigable, with a resolution that knew not how to swerve from its purpose, animated too by a sincere desire for the welfare and improvement of his people, his insatiate lust of aggrandisement limited his usefulness, and his unbounded success stimulated his self-will to frenzy. That he had warm affections, and a keen appreciation of merit, none can deny; and his religious sentiments, though often stifled by the ebullitions of passion, were certainly profound. It is impossible to reflect on his frequent forgiveness to his rebellious sons, without a feeling more tender than pity; and, if his closing scene revealed the horrid revulsion of which a father's heart is capable, when stung to madness by "a thankless child," it discloses, too, the depth of his unrequited af-

fection. Still, he was the spoiled minion of fortune. The absolute authority then vested in the crown invited his impetuous nature to the wildest excesses, while the sycophancy, that is ever ready to betray the powerful, prompted him to enterprises he might not else have attempted, and involved him in an endless maze of cruelty, injustice, and fraud. In a word, he was essentially selfish; for, though his bounty flowed profusely on those he loved, it was only at the price of unreserved devotion to his will. When that was thwarted, his excitement knew no bounds. The very impress of humanity seemed erased from his countenance, his eyes became spotted with blood, and his rage, like that of a beast, was vented on his attendants and furniture.

Theobald could not regard, but with extreme solicitude, the accession of so wayward a prince, to the stormy rule of his distracted country, and dread the aggravation of the injuries, to religion and the Church, which had characterised the preceding reign. Hence, when age and increasing infirmities constrained him to retire, from the confidential station near the throne, to which his own signal services had raised him, he commended his archdeacon to the royal favor, as one to whose piety and sagacity, prudence and firmness, might safely be committed so much influence for good or evil. Henry was not slow to discern his merit, and appointed him his chancellor.

Behold him now in a position as dangerous as elevated! but the dizzy height, where weaker brains had reeled, only invigorates him. "His sovereign's smile is on him, glory blazes about his path," but his eye is undazzled, and his step is steady. Qualified alike to charm his master's leisure, and to sway the counsels of the cabinet, he combines the elegant graces of the courtier, with the grave deliberation of the politician. His opinion is decisive in affairs of state, his favor is the passport to preferment; his ample revenues and stately magnificence are worthy of a prince; the lay barons give place before him; the bravest of England's chivalry embrace his service; his halls are thronged by the learned, the rich, and the powerful; and the poor sit in crowds at his gate.

How many "lifted up so high" had "'sdained subjection, and thought one step higher would set" them "highest!" But so clear is Becket's loyalty, that England's subtlest king invests him with the last pledge of a father's and a monarch's confidence, by entrusting to him the person and education of his son!

How many, in those festal halls,

> "when smiles were bright
> On lovely lips that murmured round,"

had yielded to the soft seductions of the flesh! But Becket's virtue is so bright that, though the king himself, in the very wantonness of power, endeavors to beguile him, the breath of slander rests not on it. No, not even Fuller, who never hesitates to circulate a calumny while disavowing his belief in it, hints a doubt of his vestal purity. His sportive wit, his gallant bearing, his sumptuous array might scandalize the austere; but when his host suspecting an intrigue, as we are told by William of Canterbury, stole softly to his midnight chamber, and found the supposed voluptuary prostrate half naked on the floor, where he had fallen asleep at his devotions, it was seen how a mortified spirit could dwell under a delicate exterior.

Among the brilliant incidents of this stage of his career, was his mission to the French king. Henry's pretensions to the earldom of Nantz, as heir to his brother Geoffrey, had alarmed the jealousy of Louis, too late aware of the impolicy of his own divorce, which had transferred the queenly dowry of Eleanor to his most dangerous vassal. To Becket was entrusted the delicate task of averting war between these powerful neighbors; and the masterly address with which he accomplished that object, and established the Plantagenet ascendancy on yet a broader basis, was as dazzling to the eye of the statesman, as his regal retinue and munificence had proved to the court and people of France.

But his energies were not circumscribed by the purlieus of palaces, or limited to the triumphs of legislation and diplomacy.

Those were days of campaign and tournament; when rank was but the insignia of military command; when wealth was measured by the array of armed retainers; and ministers dealt not their blows "on lieutenantry," from the security of the closet, but led armies to the victory their genius had planned. The family of the chancellor was a school of honor and of arms, as well as of the accomplishments and arts of peace. Nobles were proud to place their children in his service; and in Henry's campaign of Toulouse, when kings and princes crowded to his standard, Becket led into the field seven hundred knights, each attended by a squire, and, where glory beckoned or danger dared, these with their gallant leader were foremost in the fight. When Louis, at the earnest solicitation of Count Raymond, had thrown himself reluctantly into Toulouse, the fiery chancellor proposed an immediate assault, which, in the weak condition of the garrison, would have placed the royal person in his rival's power; and the dashing exploit was only prevented by Henry's cautious adherence to feudal maxims. Being left in the Querci, to defend his master's conquests after he had retired from the leaguer of his sovereign's camp, Becket stormed three castles which had been deemed impregnable, crossed the Garonne, and once more ravaged the territory of Toulouse. Summoned again to Normandy, he left his household troops to secure the fruits of his valor, enlisted, at his own expense, twelve hundred knights, and four thousand stipendiaries, and hurried to the scene of action. Upon these chivalrous details, his defamers descant with more evident satisfaction than his eulogists; and they are certainly less edifying in one, who had been commissioned to announce a gospel of peace to the nations, than they are evincive of the unreservedness with which he devoted himself to whatever he undertook. Still, some allowance must be made for the warlike spirit of those unsettled times, when bishops sometimes felt constrained to conduct in person the military aids to which their feudal tenures bound them; and the asylum of female innocence and piety, found its only protection against ruffian violence, in walls of massive strength—a guaranty not always to be disregarded, in times of boasted liberty, and a pretended land of laws.

But in all this martial prowess, in all this courtly pomp that flamed about the chancellor, was no mingling of earthly interest, unless it were the love of fame; and, from that, what noble heart was ever altogether free? If his appointments were regal in magnificence, they shed lustre on his lofty station. If wealth flowed in on him with a golden tide, it was poured forth as prodigally, for his master's service, or in works of charity. If he bore down in fierce encounter the gallant Engelvan de Trie, it was not that he might lower his conquering lance before "the queen of beauty." All his splendor, all his energy of mind or frame were but tributary to the glory of his king, a word which, in sceptred lands, embodies all those feelings, which swell to our hearts at the dearer name of country.

Another change comes over "this strange eventful history." Theobald of pious memory is gathered to his fathers, and the king determines to advance his chancellor to the vacant see. He had tested his virtue and ability, and believed him equal to the charge. He was assured of his fidelity, and that his influence in the Church, like that of his predecessor, would maintain the rights of the lawful line, in the event of a premature demise of the crown. He hoped, from his affection and gratitude, the largest compliance with his own inclination to dictate in ecclesiastical affairs.

But he dissembled long his purpose, tempted probably by the incomes of the vacant see, which were paid into his exchequer. At length he commands his favorite to prepare for a journey to England, on business of importance. He comes to take his leave; the monarch discloses his long suppressed design: "you know not the whole object of your mission—you are to become archbishop of Canterbury." How now is this nomination of one not yet a priest to the venerable seat of England's great apostle—this primacy in the national Church superadded to his political supremacy—received by "the man whom

the king delighteth to honor?" Is it on bended knee, with humble disclaimer of desert enhancing protestations of endless gratitude? No! pointing to his own glittering array, in the momentary playfulness of ancient intimacy, "how religious, how saintly a personage," he answers, "is your majesty about to set over that holy see, and that community of monks so famed for piety!" Then, changing to a tone of prophetic solemnity, "but I know most certainly that, should God permit it, you would speedily withdraw your favor; and that great affection which is now between us would be changed to the direst hate. For I know that you would exact some things, and that you have already presumed to do much, in ecclesiastical matters, which I could not permit; and therefore the envious would seize occasion to replace our friendship with enmity."

Near seven centuries have elapsed since those words were spoken, but if they have produced any thing more magnanimous, it has escaped my observation. How determined must be the prejudice which, with this reply before it, can impute to Becket the dissimulation of the ambitious, or the perfidy of the ingrate! To me it breathes in every syllable that sad resolution with which duty takes its post in the front of danger, though assured that ruin awaits it in every possible contingency; yet not without a tender retrospect, to "the old good nature and the old good humor" he saw forever departing, and which flashes in the playful sally that preludes the solemn warning of his closing words. That the chancellor was surprised by the king's avowal of his intentions is not to be supposed. The public voice had named him the future primate; his friends had saluted him by that title, and there is a consciousness of ability, which renders probable to the possessor the prognostic of those who sometimes only flatter. He doubtless, therefore, brought to the occasion the matured conclusions of his far-seeing and resolute mind. He knew the evils which the fierce wars for the succession had heaped upon the Church. He saw the daily encroachments of the temporal power, and the still more dangerous venality and corruption, which, in those turbulent times, had crept to sacred stations. The holy see itself was paralyzed by a furious schism; and on the firmness, moderation, and wisdom of the British primate, might depend not merely the liberties and discipline of the English Church, but her very continuance within the pale of Catholic unity. Too generous, therefore, in his love for God, too devoted to the interests of religion to shrink from the dread responsibility, still, true to the personal affection of his king, who might not anticipate opposition from one he had graced so prodigally, he pronounces, while it is not too late, the sad premonition so few have strength to utter—

> "Amicus usque ad altare!"
> "A friend as far as the altar!"

But Henry was not one to abandon projects deliberately formed, or distrust his own sufficiency for untried emergencies. Yet his wishes, in regard to the archiepiscopate, were not accomplished without difficulty and opposition. The chancellor himself seems to have entertained more serious scruples, after the matter was formally proposed to him, both in relation to his own fitness for so solemn a trust, and the avowed interference of the crown in an election which ought to be free. How, he might well ask himself, could he hereafter resist encroachments on the liberties of his Church, who was indebted for his own elevation in it to palpable dictation?

His objections were overruled by the authoritative representations of Cardinal Henry of Pisa, apostolic legate, who insisted on the importance of filling the primacy, at this anxious crisis, with a person of his known integrity and resolution; and, as the forms of election at least were unrestrained, no sacrifice of principle was involved in his acceptance of the office. He therefore acquiesced and departed for England. Missives declaratory of the royal pleasure were forwarded to the metropolitan synod, and other clergy, by special envoys; on one of whom, in particular, the king enjoined to labor as earnestly for the election of Becket to the primacy, as he would for the coronation of the prince were himself to die.

But, potential as we may suppose the wishes of the sovereign in those days of arbitrary sway, the election was not effected without earnest discussion. On the one hand was urged the importance of gratifying the king and securing so powerful a mediator as the chancellor between the clergy and the crown. Others represented the scandal of elevating to the highest station in the national Church one not yet empowered to offer the holy sacrifice upon her altars; and whose recent course of life qualified him rather to wield the sword than to sway the crosier. It was feared that the preferment of a courtier to so sacred a function would prove a dangerous precedent, and fill the house of God thereafter with mere favorites of the temporal prince. To this was replied, that it was not altogether new to advance individuals to high ecclesiastical authority from secular dignities; as in the case of that great archbishop of Milan who shut the door of the Church against an emperor, and compelled him to do public penance for his crime; that Becket had been originally educated for the religious state; and though he had been employed at court, had never contracted its spirit. This opinion finally prevailed, and, the bishop of London alone dissenting—as is hinted, through personal ambition of the station—Thomas was elected archbishop in the royal abbey of Westminster. Being subsequently presented to the young prince Henry, whom the king had empowered to represent himself in this ceremony, the primate elect was solemnly discharged from his obligations to the court, and surrendered free to the Church of England. His ordination to the priesthood, and consecration as archbishop, were solemnized at Canterbury the ensuing week, amid all the splendor of regal pomp, and ecclesiastical ceremony.

To a "fond idolater of old," a contest would have seemed to be maintained between Becket and Fortune, whether she could more rapidly advance him to stations of unbounded trust and dignity, or he more worthily vindicate her choice. But the Christian who knows he does "all things in him who strengtheneth," sees in these wonderful mutations, only new occasion to adore the bounty of God towards this faithful steward of his ten talents. We have seen him the exemplary student, the successful lawyer, the accomplished courtier, the skilful diplomatist, the consummate statesman, and the triumphant soldier. It remains that we contemplate him as the mirror of a Christian bishop.

Profoundly impressed at entering on his sacred office, with the necessity of reformation in the Church committed to his charge, he commences the work in his own person; conscious that he who would govern well the people of God ought himself to be their model. The hair-cloth galls his flesh to expiate any previous relaxation of discipline; under his official robes he wears the habit of the monk, to remind him of the simplicity and purity that should characterise the hierarchy; and, if he retains that external decoration which a wise regard to the influence of sensible objects on the great mass of mankind, and conformity to the practice of the Most High himself when regulating the ceremonial and ornaments of his sanctuary, have cast around his station, he labors to render it indeed "the vesture of holiness." He had, before his consecration, commanded one of his attendant clergy to apprise him of whatever he might hear said against his deportment, and mention also what himself might think amiss; well knowing, as he expressed it, that four eyes see better than two, and that our enemies become our most charitable friends, when we are willing to make their censures the occasion for more rigid self-scrutiny. He became more abstemious, more vigilant, and more assiduous at prayer. He rose habitually at two in the morning, and, having recited the office of the hour, washed the feet of thirteen poor persons, in obedience to the precept, and imitation of the practice of the Saviour; choosing the stillness of night, and a private chamber for this work of humiliation to atone for the ostentation of his former life. Weeping he would kneel before these favorites of heaven, and entreat their prayers in his behalf, dismissing them with abundant alms. He then retired to a brief repose, but rose again while the rest of the world were sleeping, and applied

himself to the study of the Holy Scripture; for which he cherished such profound respect, that, dreading to apply to it his private interpretation, he kept near him a theologian of approved piety and learning, to preserve him from the suggestions of his own imagination. After these studies and meditations, he visited the sick of his neighboring clergy, to inform himself of their necessities, and minister to their wants, as became their pastor and their father. At nine, he celebrated mass, unless when he preferred only to assist, through veneration for the sacred mysteries, which he never approached but with compunctious reverence, which choked his utterance with sobs and gushing tears. At about three he dined, and, for the prevention of idle discourse, caused some book of piety to be read during the meal; an ancient practice, confirmed by the great œcumenical council of Trent, which commands the reading of the Holy Scriptures at the tables of bishops. Such was his temperance that he was said to eat rather for preventing death, than to nourish life; yet he affected not scrupulosity in the quality of his food, and when one righteous over much professed himself scandalized by his partaking of a pheasant, he answered mildly, "one may be as gluttonous, brother, upon pulse, as on daintier fare." After dinner he withdrew, with persons of piety and learning, among whom he refreshed his mind with profitable discussions, or conferred on the affairs of his diocess.

His official administration was characterized by equal zeal with his personal habits. Knowing that on the sanctity of the pastors depends that of the people, and dreading nothing so much as to admit thieves and hirelings into the fold of the Lord, it was his custom to examine in person the qualifications of candidates for holy orders, weighing them with terrible exactness in the very balance of the sanctuary.

The extensive judicial authority of prelates in those days is well known to every reader of history. He established such order in his diocesan courts, that not one of his officials dared to receive a present from a litigant, on any pretext whatsoever.

But it was in his care of the poor that the episcopal character shone out most brilliantly. Regarding himself rather as their steward than benefactor, he never dismissed them empty handed; but on the contrary sent agents to enquire out their wants, and supply them with necessaries and comforts. It is recorded that he never sat down to eat without assembling numbers of the destitute in his palace yard, that the remains of the feast might be distributed among them; and though his table was always well supplied, on account of the many persons of distinction who frequented it, he was more bountiful in his provision for the sake of those who were to "gather up the fragments." The pious Theobald had doubled the alms of his predecessors, but St. Thomas doubled those of that venerated prelate, consecrating to the poor a tenth of his revenues, exclusive of his ordinary charities.

Hitherto he had been subjected only to the sweet, yet searching trials of prosperity: it remained for him, like the patriarch of Hus, to be proved by sterner tests.

If any portion of his charge involved peculiar responsibility, it was that which related to the temporalities of his see; those magnificent endowments which the free charity of early Catholic times was wont to provide for the spiritual or bodily relief of the destitute and the wretched; reaching forward beyond the present misery which shocks the sense and wrings a momentary sympathy, to embrace unborn generations, dear to it only by the common brotherhood of humanity. Charity of the olden time! what form of suffering has it not alleviated? what proper craving of the heart has it not labored to appease? Whose were those pewless cathedrals, unmatched in beauty and grandeur, where peer and peasant, as children of a common father, bowed down in prayer together? Who reared those countless hospitals for the sick and the infirm,—those asylums for the babe deserted at the threshold of existence, or the spouseless and despairing mother? Who built the free school of benighted ages, which now adorns with its picturesque ruin the park of some haughty noble? Who founded those "cities of colleges," and collected those exhaustless libraries, where the hire-

lings of modern learning devote their stipendiary celibacy to malign the memory of those whose bounty fats them? I need not multiply examples. Its "counterfeit presentment" still lingers among us, even under the cold utilitarian system of modern enlightenment; triumphing, through the unerring instinct of humanity, over the jealous policy which doles out a niggard bounty to posterity, only by permissive legislation! Yet, like the vital element that warms our sphere, one day to wrap it in destruction, the accumulations of her charity have ever been a source of danger to the Church. The fiery fury of tyrants and innovators had sunk to harmlessness in their mouldering dust, but for the ecclesiastical plunder with which they bribed men to sustain their novelties; but spoil once made the basis of a new system in Church and state, selfishness became enlisted to endless generations to uphold it. St. Thomas beheld with piercing eye the distant approach of this danger to the Church of England; and he met it like a champion of the faith and a guardian of the poor. Large possessions of his diocess had been usurped, amid the turmoil of former reigns, by powerful nobles; and retained through intimidation or supineness of his predecessors. To redress the flagrant wrong, he put forth his accustomed energy; took immediate possession of what belonged to the see by unquestionable and notorious right; and commenced a course of litigation for that to which the title was less clear. A vindication of these proceedings, if necessary before an American audience, might be drawn from the reluctant concession of one of his most malignant traducers. "Now that he might the more effectually attend his archiepiscopal charge," says Fuller, "he resigned his chancellorship, whereat the king was not a little offended. It added to his anger, that his patience was daily pressed with the importunate petitions of people complaining that Becket injured them. Though, generally, he did but recover to his Church such possessions as, by their covetousness, and his predecessors connivance had formerly been detained from it."*

*Church Hist. of Britain, xii cent. book iii, § 58.

I have preferred to anticipate another topic, rather than mar the entireness of the foregoing extract. The resignation of the chancellorship, to which it adverts, was the act which first estranged the affections of the king. It measurably dissolved that union between Church and state, so dear to every tyrant, royal or republican. It announced his personal secession from the councils of his master, and gave anxious omen that the warning of his reply, when first nominated to the primacy, was no vain flourish of integrity. Yet many may, perhaps, be of opinion that the step was injudicious, and that St. Thomas would have done more wisely by retaining his sovereign's ear, and averting by address the dangers which he saw approaching, than by meeting them boldly in front. His decision, however, at least incontestibly proves the sincerity with which he adopted the ascetic life with the mitre, his devotedness to the duties of his station, and his trust in God rather than human policy.

Henceforward the tide of his earthly fortune ceased to flow; yet, like his Master, robed in the brightness of eternal light on Thabor, he was permitted once more to put on his glory before his brethren, ere he commenced the painful journey of humiliations and afflictions, through which he was to enter into his rest. A council is convened at Tours, to extinguish the schism of Octavian. The dignified clergy of the Catholic world are in attendance. The archbishop of Canterbury goes to pay his homage to the legitimate successor of Peter. His fame precedes him, and, with unexampled enthusiasm, magistrates, people, clergy,—the very archbishops and cardinals, go forth to meet and conduct him in triumph to the foot of the papal throne.

From the labors of this celebrated council, where the title of the ruling pontiff was solemnly recognized, and various canons enacted for the redress of the very evils the primate was endeavoring to correct, he returned to England, where the "murky storm of royal vengeance" was silently mustering its fury.

I have already alluded to the enmity excited by his vigorous recuperation of the

property of the Church. The monarch had personal motives for sympathy with the malecontents; for the primate's earnest interposition had already constrained him to permit the election of bishops for Hereford and Worcester, which he had kept vacant for the sake of prolonged enjoyment of the diocesan revenues; and thus announced continued opposition to an abuse, to which the British sovereigns have ever been prone, robbery of religion and the poor, under the specious pretext of preserving the unoccupied temporalities.

Another ground of quarrel was the archbishop's excommunication of a nobleman who claimed the patronage of a certain church; but, in imitation of the royal usurpations above referred to, had left its altar too long unsupplied, and forcibly ejected the primate's nominee. Upon this transaction, Henry advanced a claim that no officer or tenant in chief of the crown should be excommunicated, without previous notice to himself. A practice which would have effectually subjected, in many important cases, the spiritual to the temporal arm.

But the most plausible pretext for the rupture now earnestly desired by the king, was the archbishop's refusal to surrender clergymen, accused of crimes against the public, to the cognizance of the secular magistrate; and upon no point have ingenuity and disingenuousness been more assiduously exerted to mislead the public mind. It must be confessed that no one imbued with the habits and political principles of our age and country, could tolerate for a moment the idea of two distinct systems of criminal jurisprudence and judicature, for two orders of persons, members of the same community. And the address of writers like Hume, Lyttleton, and Mosheim, and the retailers of their prejudices and errors through the countless corrupted channels of English literature and history, has artfully arrayed these modern feelings and opinions against an arrangement which existed in circumstances essentially different from ours. But we should remember that the judicial authority of the Church in temporal matters, which was recommended to the faithful, in pagan times, by the apostle of the Gentiles himself,* had been established and extended throughout Christendom by imperial legislation, from the earliest times after the conversion of Constantine, and confirmed, as part of their irregular polity, by the barbarian invaders of the empire whose free principles constitute the dearest portion of our inheritance—the common law. We should remember that the ecclesiastical tribunals were in especial favor with the people (as we also have retained many of their principles and much of their spirit), because of the superior probity, intelligence and learning of their judges, and the consistency of their decisions, when contrasted with the rude, ignorant, and ferocious barons, who, in the secular courts, applied with tyrannical caprice, the traditional maxims of heterogeneous codes, or rather customs, to the controversies of individuals, or the wrongs, real or pretended, of the state. We should remember that the ludicrous incongruity which would characterize a scheme of "courts Christian" at the present day, when innumerable discordant creeds and systems of discipline and morals would supply candidates for the clerical privilege, did not apply in times when Europe acknowledged but "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," and the sacred order, united under one visible head, "one fold and one shepherd," was regulated by a code of universal obligation, the work of the most enlightened minds, directed under the most awful sanctions to the most important subjects, and the study of which, from a very early period, was associated with that of the civil or *imperial* law, which has justly been pronounced the noblest compilation of human wisdom, applied to human affairs. We should remember, too, that the gradual, and doubtless overstrained extension of the "benefit of clergy" operated as a bounty on learning in barbarous times, when every convent was a free school, and the son of the beggar, if stamped with nature's nobility, might aspire to the highest stations attainable by genius and virtue; and we should not forget that if the gentle censures to which ecclesiastical courts were limited

* 1 Cor. vi, 1—6.

by the canons—sweet application to human frailty of that divine forbearance which "desires not the death of a sinner," and which we are daily transfusing into our criminal codes, sometimes disappointed the stern requirements of earthly justice, they did not operate that fearful indulgence to guilt exaggeration tells of; for degradation was part of the sentence for flagrant crimes; and the offender, thenceforward, became amenable to the secular jurisdiction. And if malefactors were sometimes screened from condign punishment, through personal partiality, or "esprit du corps," as I doubt not may have been,—for what institution, human or divine, has not been perverted by the unfaithfulness of earthly agents?—the concession affords no stronger argument against the "courts Christian" of Becket's time, than the exoneration, in our own day, of deliberate and notorious burglary, murder, arson, sacrilege, and libel, by American courts or juries, supplies against that glorious common law to which we cling with hereditary and personal affection. But the sweeping assertions of prejudiced opponents may well be doubted, when we reflect on the general character of the persons who filled those tribunals, their obvious and peculiar interest not to render their privilege odious, and their common concern in the maintenance of law and order, in times when their own persons and possessions had little security amid a community of half-civilized freebooting barons and their serfs.

Still, to our estimate of the primate's conduct on this great argument, we bring a principle paramount all that has been urged. He stood for the vested rights of his order. The conqueror had established "courts Christian" on a legal basis. His successors had severally enlarged the liberties and immunities of the Church; Henry himself at his coronation, having thought proper not merely to ratify his grandfather's charter by oath, but, for greater solemnity to sign and lay it on the altar. Hence, with whatever feelings men may regard the abstract principle of the controversy, the candid must acknowledge that he whom we see described in it, as an overbearing prelate, aspiring to "set his sandalled feet on princes," was but the uncompromising defender of rights entrusted to his keeping against a wilful and perjured aggressor.

The occasion for the king's assault upon the Church was taken from insulting language, used by a canon of Bedford, to the royal justiciary, in open court. Henry demanded his indictment for this offence before the spiritual tribunal; and, policy concurring with the claims of justice, a punishment was inflicted of no ordinary severity. But it comported not with the king's designs to be so easily appeased. He swore his accustomed terrible oath, "by the eyes of God," that the judges had favored the offender; and summoning the bishops to Westminster, required their consent, that whensoever thenceforward a clergyman should be degraded for a public crime, in a spiritual court, he should immediately be delivered for punishment to the lay tribunals. To a demand so subversive of the rights guaranteed at his coronation, as well as of the first principles of justice, which forbids a second trial and punishment for the same offence, the bishops, of course, returned a decided negative; and Henry, whose very application to them was an acknowledgment of the legality of the existing system, instantly attempted to annul it, through a more comprehensive surrender; addressing to them the captious question, "whether they would swear to observe the ancient customs of the realm?" Few, perhaps, but persons professionally familiar with the binding authority of precedent, in the unwritten polity of the northern nations, will appreciate the artful turn thus given to the dispute, and the effect of this new requirement to place the English hierarchy in the attitude of factious insubordination to the fundamental laws of the land, unless they would put themselves at the uncontrolled discretion of the king. But the primate answered him, with equal address, that he would do so, "saving his order;" a qualification which, as it was invariably admitted in the oath of fealty, at the coronation of a monarch, was equally appropriate in a promise to observe the customs.

Henry saw himself foiled; and having put the question successively to the other prelates, who with the disgraceful exception of the bishop of Chichester, returned the same response, denounced them furiously, as a band of conspirators against him, and rushed from the apartment. On the following day, the archbishop was divested of the wardenship of the castles of Eye and Birkhamstead.

Nothing could exceed the consternation of the bishops, when they witnessed the rage of the king, and learned his departure from London. All the terrors of persecution, exile, confiscation, imprisonment, death, seemed gathering around them; and, as usual, policy began to whisper terms of conciliation and compromise. They hastened after him to make their peace. The bishop of London, who had recently been in disgrace, availed himself industriously of the occasion, to reinstate himself in his master's favor, by gaining over others to his will. But their own timidity and selfishness had predisposed them to grasp at every overture, and the undaunted primate soon saw himself alone. To subdue his opposition the monarch spared neither threats nor flattery. His brother prelates plied him with every suggestion of consideration for the safety of the Church, and gratitude for the king's previous unbounded favor. They charged upon his obstinacy all the evils of the coming persecution; they inveighed against the pride, which exalted his single judgment over that of all his brethren. They cited the temporising policy of St. Peter, with the Judaising Christians, and that of St. Paul, when he circumcised Timothy, to justify a momentary concession (which they insisted involved no principle), to obviate the otherwise inevitable desolation of the house of God. They even produced a pretended letter from the Pope, advising acquiescence, in the present distracted condition of the Church, rather than to aggravate it by ill-timed resistance to the king; who, they assured him, cherished no ulterior designs against religion, but merely sought to vindicate his royal dignity, which he had considered impaired by their mistrust and opposition. Less convinced than overpowered, unchanged in opinion, but distrusting his own convictions in opposition to those of men he had esteemed for wisdom and sanctity, Becket at last gave way, followed the sovereign to the luxurious bowers of Woodstock, and agreed to make the promise, omitting the obnoxious reservation. Henry received him graciously, and immediately gave orders for a general council of the realm at Clarendon.

The archbishop, whose penetration had never been deceived in this transaction, now clearly understood the evil intentions of the king, and was only by the most urgent persuasion induced to attend that assembly, firmly resolved, however, to consent to nothing inconsistent with the dictates of his conscience or prejudicial to religion. The appointment of his enemy, John of Oxford, to the presidency of the council, and the menacing tone with which the king commanded the assembled bishops to fulfil their engagements, confirmed his suspicions. Preferring, therefore, the imputation of fickleness, to the violation of duty, he humbly besought the king to excuse his compliance; assuring him that the most mature deliberation had led him to the conclusion, that he could not keep his promise consistently with his obligations to his God. The rage of Henry, at this unexpected recantation, was terrible. He accused him, in the fiercest terms, of adding insult to perfidy; and menaced him with exile or instant death. As he left the room, in a transport of fury, the adjacent apartment was seen filled with armed men, their clothes tucked up as ready for action, and weapons drawn. Again was the primate assailed with argument, invective, prayers, and lamentations. Two noblemen assured him that the king was bent on the last extreme of vengeance. Bishops and mailed knights of the holy temple fell prostrate at his feet, imploring him not to deluge the Church with the blood of her ministers, and his better angel left his side, or rather, like the prince of the apostles, he was permitted to fall, that he might thenceforth distrust forever his own weakness, and rely exclusively on the grace of God. Fearless him-

self, but palsied by the fears of others, the ice-bolt shot into his heart by coward tongues, which were soonest to denounce his involuntary recreancy, he once more shrunk from the dread responsibility of his position, deferred to others the dictates of his own clear understanding, and the noble impulses of his own high nature, and took the oath prescribed.

Did he gain peace by his momentary pliancy? Alas! who ever stifled with suggestions of expediency, the instinctive promptings of honor and virtue—that voice of "God within us"—without smarting, even here, under its keen rebuke? Soliciting an adjournment till the following day, that these yet uncertain customs might be clearly defined, he found, when the committee for compiling them made their report, his worst forebodings more than realized. He saw legalized that usurpation by the crown, to which I have already alluded, of those vacant episcopal and priorial revenues, which had been destined by the donors for the maintenance of religion and charity; and the elections of the hierarchy subjected to the royal dictation and veto—a principle so subversive of ecclesiastical order, that ourselves have seen it refused, as the bonus for proffered Catholic emancipation, from a more than kingly thraldom of three centuries. He saw the vested jurisdiction of the spiritual courts annulled; the Church disarmed, in the most important cases, of her almost only weapon against innovators in doctrine, subverters of discipline, and spoilers of her property and rights—the power to sever offenders from the society of the faithful; and her intercourse with the centre of Catholic unity made dependent on the will of the monarch. Some few of the constitutions of Clarendon were indifferent, as regarded vital principle; but their general tendency was to limit the beneficent influences of religion, or subsidize her to earthly tyranny; and this was admitted by Henry himself, when, after the primate's death, he abrogated all. The archbishop took his final stand. He refused to authenticate them by another act; while the other bishops affixed their seals, in token of their ratification, as commanded by the king: yet, dissembling for the moment, he pleaded the necessity for deliberation, received a copy and withdrew.

Such were the transactions from which the charges of perjury and breach of faith have been derived against this martyr to principle. Let me, therefore, briefly recapitulate. His promise at Woodstock was void, being given under a delusive statement of the king's intentions. The palpable duress at Clarendon annulled his oath; which, had it even been voluntary, could not have obliged him to obey the famous constitutions there set forth, which certainly were not "the ancient customs of the realm."

That he never signed that compilation seems probable from many considerations. 1. His name in the enrollment, as recorded in the Epistolæ Sancti Thomæ, cited by Hume,* is evidently the work of the engrossing clerk; like those of the *parties*, in the premises of an ordinary deed; and was inserted, with those of the other notable persons present, according to the customary form of ancient statutes, as appears from that of Merton, the earliest extant.† 2. The entire silence on the subject of signing, in the quadrilogus, referred to by Dr. Lingard, together with the emphasis laid on his refusal to seal, conveys to my mind directly the reverse of the common opinion.

3. The king undoubtedly considered that the assent of the bishops was to be attested by their sealing; which was the mode, at that period in use, (adopted from the Normans) for authenticating deeds;‡ and hence his rage when he finally discovered that the primate would not seal. 4. Had this not been the case, Becket's request for delay, that he might have time to examine the collection of customs, previously to sealing, which was granted by the king, would have been frivolous and vexatious.

* Tom. i, page 25, Epist. xxii.

† The critical reader will note that I here follow the classification adopted by the committee for publishing the statutes at large; who, in their magnificent work, a copy of which was presented by the British government to the Baltimore Library, place Magna Charta, (usually considered by the profession the earliest of the statutes) among the "charters of liberties" and not the "statutes."

‡ Blackstone's Commentaries, p. 306.

His whole offence was this. He suffered himself to appear to be imposed on, in relation to the king's designs, which he too clearly understood, and, by his half-way, though extorted compliances, and vague promises, gave a semblance of sanction to the base and undisguised recreancy of his brethren.

And now, with an aching heart, he takes his homeward way. His train, in muttered tones, express their thoughts upon the late transactions. Some justify his conduct, by the plea of harsh necessity, others lament that the shepherd should have fled before the wolf. Among these, his cross bearer vents, in no measured terms, his grief and indignation. His piercing censures reach the founts of contrition in his master's heart. He bursts into tears and lamentations, confesses the enormity of his guilt, condemns his presumption in accepting a station, for which his former life had not prepared him, and, in expiation of his momentary apostacy, interdicts himself from approaching the altar, and every sacred function. In vain his attendants strive to soothe his affliction: he remains disconsolate and devoted to penance, till letters from the Pope arrive, absolving him from his fault, encouraging him to future fidelity, and admonishing him to seek support and consolation, where only they can be found, in the sacramental means of grace.

When Henry was apprised of his final resolution, not to ratify the constitutions of Clarendon, he indulged in such transports of passion that all trembled for the primate's life. Warned of his danger, and desirous also to confer with his holiness in person, he determined secretly to withdraw to France, the proud asylum of old for persecuted pontiffs, where Alexander had taken refuge, from the fury of the antipope.

He therefore twice embarked, but was as often driven back by contrary winds, or, as some suppose, prevented by the fears of the mariners, who, dreading the anger of the king, pretended that they could not accomplish the voyage. Considering, therefore, that it was the will of God he should remain, he returned to Canterbury, where the king's officers, who had been despatched to seize his effects, on the rumor of his flight, found him on the following day. Henry was rejoiced at his return; for he dreaded the report of his tyranny abroad, and a papal interdict on his dominions. Various attempts at conciliation were subsequently made by the primate, in person, and through the mediation of the bishop of Evreux; but the king was peremptory for the confirmation of the constitutions of Clarendon, and the archbishop as inflexibly determined to oppose them with his utmost power.

It was now evident to Henry that the primate's destruction must precede his desired triumph over the liberties of the Church; but, dreading the odium of open violence, he resolved to effect his ruin by the more insidious course of law. A council of the realm was therefore convened at Northampton, to which the archbishop was summoned, rather as a culprit than a peer. John of Oxford presided, as at Clarendon; and the king appeared as prosecutor. He first charged the primate with contumacy, in not appearing in his court, on a certain appeal, when duly cited. Becket denied the contempt, alleged severe illness as the cause of his absence, and the attendance of a deputation of his knights with his excuses; but Henry furiously swore that judgment should be rendered against him; and the servile court, the bishops unanimously concurring, for every spark of liberty had been trodden out, amerced him in the forfeiture of all his goods. He compromised with the king for a fine of five hundred pounds, equal to more than thirty thousand dollars of our money, and gave security for the payment.

On the following day the king demanded three hundred pounds, which Becket had levied on the castles of Eye and Birkhamstead, while in his custody. He replied that he had expended more than that in repairs of those castles; to the actual condition of which he referred for proof. "But money" said he, "shall be no cause of quarrel between me and my sovereign; I will pay the sum"—and he gave security.

The next exaction was for five hundred pounds, which the king alleged he had loaned him, during the campaign of Tou-

louse. Becket averred that it had been given; but, as his word might not countervail his sovereign's, he was condemned to pay, and gave security.

But endurance was exhausted when the morrow brought forward a requisition for an account of all the rents of the vacant abbeys and bishoprics, with whatever other royal revenues had been received by him while chancellor. He answered that, when chosen to the see of Canterbury, he had been legally discharged from every bond of the court, by the prince, and the king's justiciary, representing by commission the royal person. Still, for the suddenness of the demand, he asked leave for consultation with his brethren of the hierarchy. It was granted and they withdrew.

Pitiable was the chilled conference in their temporary prison, for the doors were locked on them by order of the king. The bishop of London advised him to resign his see, and others seconded the insidious counsel. Old Henry of Winchester, alone, spoke worthily of his royal blood; and the bishop of Worcester gave faint and equivocal utterance to sentiments he dared not openly avow.

That the king intended to compel his resignation was clear; for the sums demanded exceeded his archiepiscopal revenues, and he could neither pay them nor procure security. Hence it was supposed he must throw himself on the royal mercy. But those who argued thus knew not the man. Driven to extremity, he resolved to cast around him the panoply of his sacred station, and involve his cause with that of God and religion. Accordingly, he asked a respite till the following day, and was set at liberty.

And now was commended to his quivering lip that bitterest drop in the chalice of the Lord—the desertion of those summer friends, who fall off like leaves of autumn, at the first chill blast of adversity. Where was the gorgeous retinue of knights and barons, who had swelled his escort to the council? Scared at the monarch's frown they had slunk away, and the proscribed archbishop returned unhonored to his lodging; but he replaced them with the poor and decrepit, whom he convened from the neighborhood, and feasted at his table with holy joy.

Severe indisposition prevented his attendance on the following morning, and two noblemen were sent to cite him before the council. He indicated his suffering condition, but promised to appear on the morrow, although it should be necessary to bear him on a litter. Information was conveyed to him, in the course of the day, that his death or imprisonment might be relied on, should he dare to appear at court without acceding to the king's demands. Early the next morning, the bishops made one more effort to induce him to resign; but he rejected their counsel, and rebuked their desertion. Then going to the church he celebrated the mass of the proto-martyr, in whose fate, commemorated by that beautiful introit, "princes sat and spoke against me, and sinners persecuted me," he felt a touching resemblance to his own.

Strengthened with the "bread of angels" he now addressed himself to the encounter with the malice of man. He came down from the holy altar as became the high priest of God, "clothed in robes of glory, and crowned with majestic attire."* Bearing in his hand the conquering sign of salvation, he proceeds towards the palace. The startled bishops are informed of his purpose and rush forward to prevent it. "Let me be your cross-bearer," says the bishop of Hereford, "for so it becomes me!" "No," replies the primate, "this cross is my safeguard, it shall tell them under what prince I combat!" "If the king sees you enter with these arms," exclaims the time-serving bishop of London, endeavoring to wrest it from him, "he will unsheath his own. It will then be seen which are the most to be relied on!" "That," replies the saint, "I leave to God."

But the tyrant and his train retire before the sacred emblems, like the guilty things of night flying from "Hyperion's glittering shafts of war." They withdraw to an inner chamber, where the courtiers stimulate his frantic rage till themselves begin to fear.

* Ecclesiasticus xlv, 9.

The order for a massacre trembles on his foaming lip. The archbishop of York himself calls his chaplains to "begone with him, lest they be witnesses to the primate's murder!" And now the attendants, hurrying through the hall with implements of death and torture, "glared on him with terrible looks," as he sat in that desolation which drenched his Saviour's soul, when abandoned on the cross by those for whom he bled. No mother stood near to mingle her woes with his, like the blessed one on Calvary!—but a beloved disciple sat steadfast at his feet, to whom he whispered, "I fear indeed for thee,—but fear thou not, for thou shalt share my crown!" And Herbert de Boseham answered, "we need neither fear, for thou hast raised that holy standard, terrible to principalities and powers, in which so many have conquered." While they whisper, the bishop of Exeter rushes in, and throws himself at his feet, conjuring him to spare himself and the whole episcopal order, for that the king had denounced death to the first who should speak in his behalf. "Fly thou, then!" replies the dauntless primate, "for thou savourest not the things that are of God."

Meanwhile the panic-struck bishops who remain about the king, in the extremity of their bewilderment propose an expedient. They will denounce the archbishop to the Pope for perjury in not obeying the constitutions of Clarendon, and so procure his deposition. The suggestion pleases. They hasten to him, and with opprobrious language cite him before the common father of Christendom. "I hear you," is his calm reply.

At length, as they sit in anxious silence on opposite sides of the hall, the door of the king's apartment opens, and a crowd of barons come forth. The earl of Leicester at their head, advances towards him, and commands him to appear before the king and answer his demands, or listen to his sentence. "My sentence!" cries the primate, rising; "son and earl first hear thou me!" He recapitulates his faithful service to his sovereign; his acquiescence, against his own inclination, in his elevation to the see of Canterbury; his formal discharge by the royal commissioners from his secular obligations. Then solemnly protesting against the jurisdiction, and committing his cause and his Church to the protection of the holy see, before which he cites his apostate brethren, he retires from the hall.

As he passed, that coward spirit, so prompt to ruffle against the bondmen of the cross, burst into insult and outrage. Knots of straw, the rude matting of the age, were thrown, and some one called him "perjured traitor!" For an instant a flash of worldly temper lightened through the calm of heavenly courage. Sternly regarding his revilers, he exclaimed, "But that my order restrains me, that coward should repent of his insolence!"

> "From amidst them forth he passed,
> Long way through hostile scorn, which he sustained
> Superior; nor of violence feared aught;
> And, with retorted scorn, his back he turned
> On those proud towers to swift destruction doomed."

He was attended to his lodging by a crowd of the infirm and poor, whom he caused to enter and partake of his repast. The persecution of Bishop Liberius was read at table, and the divine injunction, "when they shall persecute you in one city, flee ye to another," was observed to make a deep impression on his mind. He sent to the king, soliciting his license to depart the realm, but received an evasive answer. That evening positive intelligence was brought, that certain nobles of desperate character had conspired for his destruction; and acting on the apostolic regulation above referred to, he escaped from the city in disguise, with two attendants, and travelling on foot, by night, through devious paths, exposed for fifteen days to every form of privation and hardship, he at last arrived at the coast, and embarking in a small boat, was landed near Gravelines, in Flanders.

The necessary limits of a discourse already too protracted, forbid the attempt to follow him through the vicissitudes of his long and painful exile of fourteen years; interesting and edifying as it might be to contemplate him, at one time drenched by the storm and fainting in the mire, at another, welcomed and caressed by a powerful king; now

pleading his cause, with triumphant ability, before the sovereign pontiff, and anon edifying the monks in the quiet cloisters of Pontigny.

Henry had endeavored, by an imposing embassy of prelates and nobles, to preoccupy the mind of Louis, and corrupt or overawe the sacred college; but the former with dignity announced his determination to shelter the holy wanderer; and the latter, despite the gold profusely scattered among them, and caught at by many, with "itching palms," could not impugn the justice of his conduct.

The sovereign pontiff, straitened as he was by the cruel circumstances of the time, and constrained to the most cautious policy, by the dread of Henry's oft threatened defection to the schism of Octavian, which might have drawn after him to ruin so many souls, still approved himself worthy of his station, by the firmness with which he condemned the greater portion of the constitutions of Clarendon, and declined availing himself of Becket's resignation of his see; when he might have conciliated the king by providing for the primate elsewhere.

But if Henry could not conquer, he could at least annoy. He confiscated Becket's goods, erased his name from the liturgy, and seized the revenues of every clergyman who had either followed him to France, or sent him assistance. His relatives and friends were likewise made to feel the royal vengeance. Their possessions were confiscated, their persons exiled, neither sex or rank procuring exemption or mitigation. Helpless age and wailing infancy were alike involved in this horrible proscription; which a refinement of malice aggravated to the sufferers, by the imposed obligation of an oath to repair to Pontigny, that the archbishop might be afflicted with the sight of their distress. Four hundred victims of this cruel policy sought his asylum, and its peaceful shades resounded with their lamentations. But tyranny met its antidote in a noble commiseration. Louis and Alexander exerted their influence; the primate wrote letters to his continental friends; and these exiles for Christ received shelter and protection, compensated in after ages, when the refugees of France, escaped from guillotine or dagger, reposed under the mantle of England's hospitality, which themselves repaid in turn by rekindling the decayed fires of her altars.

Still regal hatred had not emptied its quiver. As Pontigny belonged to the Cistercian order, Henry threatened their expulsion from his dominions, if they continued to harbor the object of his wrath. Becket accordingly left them, but was promptly consoled by Louis, who, with strong expressions of wonder and contempt, that men professing to be dead to the world, should yet, through fear of wordly loss, withdraw their countenance from a champion of the Church, appointed him an asylum in the city of Sens. It was on this occasion that, parting from the abbot, he communicated, under the seal of secrecy, a vision of the preceding night. He seemed to be standing in a church, contending against the king in the presence of the Pope and sacred college; the holy father sustaining him, and the cardinals advocating the cause of the king; when four knights entering, dragged him from the presence, and tore away his scalp where he had received the tonsure, so that he seemed to die. This dream or vision, which he interpreted as foreshadowing his mode of death, was disclosed by the abbot after the saint's decease.

Long and vexatious were the negociations which sprung from this unhappy quarrel; exhaustless the resources of Henry's diplomacy. At one time he would set at nought his boasted constitutions, by authorising appeals to the Pope from the mandates of the primate, who had been clothed with legantine powers. At others he would ask for legates to decide between them. Repeatedly were such appointed to judge the cause, and as often beguiled by the address, or swayed by the gold of the king. Great was the interest he maintained among the cardinals; ceaseless were his efforts to cajole, intimidate, or elude the Pope. At the diet of Wurtzburg, his confidential agents swore adherence, in his name, to the new antipope Guido; and again their master disavowed their acts. Yet, to guard his insular dominions from the dreaded interdict,

he severed England from the holy see by a series of edicts more arbitrary than those of Clarendon, compelling his subjects, above the age of fifteen, to swear obedience to them; and which, had the bishops of the twelfth century, obsequious as they were, been as pliant as those of the sixteenth, would have anticipated the last fatal separation by nearly four hundred years.

Yet was he vulnerable on the side of his continental possessions; and the interdict—that last appeal to the popular mind and heart against a despot's power—might fall on them.

To avert this danger, against which he could not guard, many interviews were concerted between him and the primate; but they as often ended in disappointment, while one for ever aimed to make good his usurpations on the Church, and the other as resolutely contended for her unimpaired liberties.

At the conference of Montmirail, which took place in the presence of the king of France, Henry's subtlety for the moment prevailed over all but his far-seeing subject. The archbishop, having thrown himself at the feet of his sovereign, who raised him with demonstrations of tenderness, besought him humbly to commiserate the English Church. "To your majesty's judgment," continued he, "I here, in the presence of our lord of France, these reverend prelates, and powerful nobles, commit the whole cause which has divided us—saving the honor of God." The fatal reservation kindled Henry's rage, and he burst into expressions of unmeasured resentment. Then changing his tone, with an accustomed suddenness that imparted to his address the semblance of the most wavering caprice, he exclaimed that he would be content with such submissions from the primate, as the greatest of his predecessors in the see had rendered to his own. The assembly loudly declared that this was an honorable overture; and Louis himself feelingly urged Becket to comply. But he answered in the spirit of a man with whom religion is a reality, and not a conventional form; "it is true my predecessors were better and greater than I; but all of them, in their day, cut off some abuses, though not all. Had they done so, I should not have to stand in the present contest. If any of them were too cool or immoderate in their zeal, we are not bound to copy their example. Freely would I return to my Church were it possessed of the liberties it enjoyed in the time of my predecessors; but admit customs which are adverse to the decrees of the holy fathers I will not." He was proceeding—probably to plead the examples of a Lanfranc and an Anselm—when his attendants drew him forcibly aside, and urged him by every consideration, to drop that reservation of "the honor of God." "And must I sacrifice that honor," cried the indignant prelate, "to regain the favor of a mortal? Away!—away!" Bitter reproaches, for imputed arrogance and obstinacy, were now heaped upon him by the French and English courtiers, and the kings displeased, withdrew; he only remaining unmoved, while his friends accompanied him to Sens, on the following day, in silence and dejection, or muttered their disappointment and anxiety. Louis had evidently withdrawn his favor, for he had neither visited him the preceding evening, nor sent him provisions for his table, according to his custom. Another exile seemed in prospect; and the archbishop cheerfully announced his plan to go on foot to the simple-hearted people on the borders of Provence, and seek an asylum with them until better times. While thus conversing he was summoned to the presence of the French monarch. In sadness the king received him; and, without rising, coldly bade him be seated. For a space he seemed lost in sorrow, and struggling to give utterance to some painful communication. Then, while all were momently expecting the sentence of banishment, he rose, and bursting into tears, fell at the primate's feet. As he stooped to raise him, "indeed, father," he exclaimed, "you only saw clearly. We were blinded who advised you to abandon the honor of God for the favor of a man. I am sincerely sorry, and implore your forgiveness." The report of this interview gave great offence to Henry, who sent ambassadors to complain. But Louis answered with becoming pride, "go tell your king that if he will not relinquish customs which

some deem contrary to the law of God, because they appertain to his royal dignity, neither will I surrender the hereditary privilege of my crown, to succor those who suffer in the cause of justice."

On another occasion, the archbishop worded his submission so unexceptionably—it being the same which was ultimately accepted—that the most flattering hopes existed of an immediate reconciliation; but it was prevented by the king's refusal to give the "kiss of peace," which the primate solicited in token of his sincerity.

Meanwhile, he had not suffered his spiritual weapons to slumber. His letters to the king and the prevaricating bishops are still extant, breathing at once the tender love, blended with the awful sternness of an anxious father. I wish I could have ventured to detain you, with even the briefest extracts from them. Nothing realises more vividly to me the perpetuity of the faith, than the pastoral writings of Popes and bishops of the olden time. They declare the whole counsel of God, with a force and precision, nay, often a classical elegance, unsurpassed, if equalled at the present day; and while reading them, we are almost persuaded by their freshness, that we live in the times to which they belong. Truths unchangeable, eternal interests, are treated as at present; and we feel that we walk by no new-fangled lights of modern invention, but that the fire celestial, which baptized the twelve, shines on forever in their successors, unto the perfect day. But affectionate remonstrance and solemn warning were wasted alike upon Becket's persecutors; and, with a tardy and reluctant hand, he launched the thunder. He excommunicated the prominent instigators of the king's hostility, the abettors of the constitutions of Clarendon, and the spoilers of the Church of Canterbury, and only spared Henry himself on account of his dangerous illness. Yet this unavoidable severity was deprived of its efficacy by the facility with which the legates, from time to time, deceived by the king's duplicity, or willing to conciliate his favor, interposed to mitigate the canonical censures.

At length the tyrant's political embroilments compelled him to give peace to the church. Desiring the coronation of his son, he procured that ceremony from the archbishop of York, and four assistant prelates; notwithstanding letters from the Pope inhibiting their intrusion on a function, which, by old prescriptive right, appertained to the see of Canterbury. But as the princess was not crowned with her husband, her father, Louis, resenting the neglect, invaded Normandy. Beset with difficulties, Henry renewed his former treaties with France; and, in the interview with Louis which assured their peace, promised definitively a speedy reconciliation with the primate. They met, and the terms were adjusted; the latter promising "whatever could be performed, in the Lord, by an archbishop to his sovereign;" and the king engaging to receive him into favor, with security to himself and his dependents, the restoration of the Church of Canterbury with its possessions, and amendment for the violation of its dignity in the prince's coronation.

Peace had now been permanent, but for that spirit of private interest which, in every age, finds profit in the maintenance of error, and disturbance of the Church. Who would resign the confidence of an earthly monarch for the smiles of the Eternal?—Who would disgorge the spoil of a diocess, though countless plundered souls might starve and perish everlastingly? "Better to reign in the hell" of schism, "than serve in the heaven" of evangelical order! So, at least, thought Roger, archbishop of York, Gilbert, bishop of London, and their coadjutors, lay and clerical, in the work of ecclesiastical misrule. The king had sent mandates to his son to restore the archdiocess, in the condition it was in three months before the primate's flight; but when the agents of the latter arrived, to take possession in his name, they found the rents levied, the timber felled, the crops and cattle carried off, the furniture and buildings wasted and dilapidated. Twice again he sought his sovereign's presence, but was met by "changed affection's altered eye;" nor could his remonstrances gain any thing but deceitful promises. With a heavy heart, and bor-

rowed money, he at length prepared for his return; notwithstanding the forebodings of his friends, and the open threats of his enemies.

The Pope had, previously to the reconciliation, furnished him with letters of excommunication against the prelates who assisted at the coronation of the prince; and subsequently renewed them against Roger of York, and the bishops of London and Salisbury, to whose machinations was justly imputed the king's delay to fulfil his engagements. These letters he is supposed to have intended to suppress, for the sake of concord; but those guilty ecclésiastics, knowing that he carried them about his person, and dreading the merited punishment of their misdeeds, assembled at Canterbury, and despatched to the coast Ranulf de Broc, Reginald de Warrene, and Gervase de Cornhill, with a band of soldiers, to search and take them from him; but the lay conspirators publicly threatened his life. Roused by this audacity, the archbishop sent the letters by a trusty messenger, who delivered them to the bishops in the presence of their attendants.

This act has been censured, even by well disposed writers, as illjudged and vindictive. It is difficult, however, to decide the merit of measures by their consequences. We see the result of one procedure; we can only conjecture that of its opposite. Unsuccessful vigor incurs the blame of rashness; unsuccessful forbearance is denounced as cowardice or folly. Yet it seems that, in Becket's case, reasonable endurance was exhausted, and that longer impunity would only have invited to grosser outrage.

But the fury of the foiled conspirators was unbounded as their disappointment. They burst into complaints of the primate's arrogance and vindictiveness; they accused him to the young king of designing to uncrown him; they hastened to Normandy to inflame the passions of Henry.

That the latter had been aware of the archbishop's danger is evident, from the appointment of John of Oxford, his declared enemy, to escort him to Canterbury; an insult which can only be explained, by the known influence of that individual, as the king's confidential agent, to ensure his protection. He landed at Sandwich on the first of December. The armed band, who had expected him at Dover, marched hastily against him; but the inhabitants, who received him with acclamations, took up arms in his defence. John of Oxford, in the king's name, forbade the insurgents from attempting violence, but permitted their approach in a less hostile manner. They questioned the primate rudely about the suspension of the bishops, but observing the rising indignation of the people, withdrew to their instigators at Dover.

Surrounded by an exulting population, who celebrated his return with every appropriate demonstration, St. Thomas re-entered Canterbury on the following day. But his joy was of short duration. On the morrow, came back the aforenamed barons, with the chaplains of the suspended prelates, to demand the recall of their sentence; which they asserted had been pronounced in defiance of the king and the customs of the realm. "I did it," replied he, "with the king's permission, and to revoke their sentence were to undo the act of my superior, the Roman pontiff." More closely urged, he mitigated his resolution, and proposed to assume the responsibility of absolving the two bishops, if they would swear, in the accustomed form, to obey the Pope's injunctions in this behalf. The case of the archbishop of York had been reserved by the sovereign pontiff to himself. As the bishops had taken the same oath, when a previous excommunication, by the primate only, had been revoked by the legates, they wavered and were about to comply. But the archbishop of York, declaring that he had eight thousand marks of silver, which he would freely spend to humble the primate, and urging the insincerity of Henry's reconciliation with him, prevailed on them to join him rather in appealing to the king.

St. Thomas now proposed to visit the young king, to whom he had already announced his return, and explained the cause of the suspension of the bishops; but their malicious and absurd insinuations had alarmed the youthful monarch, and his

officers met the primate in London, with peremptory orders to return to his see.

Sad and anxious was his Christmas preparation; for the advent of the Lord was not, for him, in the "peace on earth to men of good will." His days were spent in retirement, prayer, and other duties of his sacred station; but they were darkened by danger and distress. The threats of his enemies grew louder and more violent, his possessions were plundered, his provisions intercepted, his servants insulted and beaten. The festival of joy arose in sorrow: mournfully the arches of his cathedral gave back the angels' hymn. He ascended the pulpit, at high mass, and preached with unusual unction. At the close of his discourse, he told his people that he soon should leave them, and they would be satisfied who thirsted for his blood. Sobs and stifled lamentations overpowered his firmness, and for a moment he dissolved in sympathetic grief; but, rousing from the melting mood, he declaimed against the vices of the age; and declaring that he would not die before vindicating the injuries of his Church, solemnly excommunicated Ranulf and Robert de Broc, who for seven years had ravened on its spoil.

Meantime, the suspended prelates had repaired to Normandy, where they threw themselves at the monarch's feet, imploring his protection against the primate, who they falsely asserted had excommunicated all who were present at the prince's coronation. "Then by God's eyes," shouted Henry, "he has excommunicated me!" They went on to state that Becket, with an armed force, had advanced against the youthful king, intending to seize his castles: and their royal dupe responded with curses on all his bounty had fed or favor distinguished, who yet would not avenge him of a single priest, the disturber of his realm. "One man," cried he, in the frenzy of alarm and fury, "one man, who has eaten of my bread, has lifted up his heel against me! One man, insulting my benefits, dishonors the whole royal race, and with impunity tramples down my kingdom! One man, who burst into my court on a crippled beast of burthen, has deposed the royal line, and, in your presence, peers, sits exulting on the throne!" Could such language be mistaken? Four knights took that hint from his incoherent rage, which even royalty loves not to give explicitly.

Reginald Fitzurse, William de Traci, Richard Brito, and Hugh de Moreville resolved to satisfy the king, and left his court in secrecy. He suspected their purpose, and sent messengers to prohibit violence. But their haste eluded his precautions.

At Saltwood, the castle of the notorious De Brocs, they matured the details of their murderous plot, and taking with them a band of soldiers, proceeded on the twenty-ninth of December, with arms concealed, to Canterbury. A wretch, by name Clarembaldus, whom Henry had forced upon the monks, was prior of St. Austin's. By him were the assassins received, and with him they conferred on the execution of their bloody design.

Abruptly entering the apartment of the primate, who having dined was conversing with his monks, on business of the diocess, they seated themselves at his feet, bent, as will appear in the sequel, to elicit from his ardent temperament some plausible excuse for violence. "We bring you orders from the king," said Fitzurse, "will you hear them in public or in private." "As you please," was his reply. "In private then," rejoined Fitzurse; and the company were requested to withdraw; but a moment's reflection suggesting to the archbishop the propriety of having witnesses, he called to his clergy to return. Reginald commenced the altercation, by commanding him to go to the young king and perform his duties; and, for a space, the conversation took a general captious turn, while Fitzurse urged vague accusations of dereliction, and his intended victim demanded specific charges. At length the ruffian ordered him to absolve the excommunicated bishops. "That," answered Becket, "belongs not to me, but to the Pope who excommunicated them." "At least," replied Fitzurse, "you procured it." "I confess," rejoined the prelate, "I am not displeased, when the Pope avenges the wrongs of my Church." "Your pleasure," said Fitzurse, "in their

disgrace, for having dared to crown the prince, shows clearly that you would fain snatch the crown from his head, and be yourself the king." "Rather," answered Becket, "would I give him three or four such crowns, if my power equalled my will; nor does any one, I think, the king alone excepted, love him more tenderly, or more ardently desire his welfare. And as to the bishops, whom you assert to have been suspended or excommunicated by me, yourselves well know that whatever has been done was with the king's consent; for when, on the festival of the blessed Mary Magdalene, after peace had been restored between us, I complained to him of the many injuries that had been done to my Church, and especially of those prelates who, in contempt of their mother see of Canterbury, had dared usurp my function, he, of his own grace, conceded, that I might obtain whatever redress I could from our lord the Pope, insomuch that he not only gave consent, but promised his assistance." At this Fitzurse exclaimed, "Hold! you tell of unexampled treachery! the king grant you permission to suspend or excommunicate those who, by his command, assisted at his son's coronation? He never admitted such a thought! But you are guilty of a monstrous crime, insinuating such perfidy against your sovereign!" "Reginald, Reginald," responded the primate, "I by no means accuse the king of treachery. But our peace was made, and our agreements adjusted, not in secrecy; for archbishops, bishops, many persons of great distinction, five hundred clergymen, still more knights were present; nay you also, lord Reginald, were there." "I was not there," replied Fitzurse, "nor did I hear or see those things." "Nay," answered Becket, "God knoweth, but I am sure I saw you." But he, with frantic perjury, denying he was there, continued: "This is wonderful beyond all precedent, that you should impute such treachery to our king; he would not bear it longer, nor will we his liegemen." And his accomplices burst forth likewise in oaths and threats. The archbishop resumed, complaining of the outrages which had been committed against his people and his property, since his return, the open insults and injuries he had sustained, and now these threats. "Why did you not complain?" replied Fitzurse, "you would have had justice done you." "But to whom," asked Becket, "could I appeal?" "To the king in England," said Fitzurse. "My friend," said the archbishop, "I have complained enough. I have exposed my wrongs enough, I have labored enough to obtain redress. Besides, so many injuries are heaped on me from day to day, that I could not find a messenger for each. But however I expose my grievances, it availeth nothing; for the young king and his justices, depending on the pleasure of the king abroad, do nothing without consulting him; but to me is denied both justice here, and the privilege of going to him. Whence I am hardly dealt with. But, since I find not justice here or there, I will do what an archbishop can and ought to do; nor for mortal will I refrain." "Threats! threats!" exclaimed one of the conspirators, "will you interdict the entire kingdom, and excommunicate us all?" "No, by God's help," cried another, "he hath anathematized too many already." Then springing from their seats, with furious words and gestures, they charged the monks to keep him securely, and prevent his escape, as they should answer for him to the king. But he retorted, "Think you I shall fly? I will not fly for the king or any mortal. I came not here to fly, but to meet the rage of the wicked." "True, true," cried the assassins, "you shall not escape!" And they went forth in a tumult of threats and insults. But he, following to the door, called after Hugh de Moreville to return, as he wished to speak with him; but he would not. Then one of his attendants, John of Salisbury, remonstrated with him for not taking counsel with his friends, and proceeding more cautiously towards men, who he knew were only aiming to "take him in his words." "My whole counsel is taken," said the primate, "I know what I am to do." "God grant," replied the other, "it may eventuate well!"

In the court yard, the murderers and their

soldiers threw off their outer garments which concealed their armor, and with swords and axes, and other implements of death or to break through obstacles, returned towards the palace. Some of the household running to the archbishop, exclaimed, "Master, they are arming!"—but he answered, "Who cares? let them arm!" The servants barred the principal door against them, but Robert de Broc, who was familiar with the premises, led the way to a private stair connecting with the garden, where they burst through a window and gained entrance.

Slowly and reluctantly, at the compulsory instance of his monks, the archbishop withdrew through the cloisters to the church, where they were singing vespers; but seeing some about to bar the door—"Cowards!" said he, "begone; let the blind wretches rage! in virtue of your obedience, close not the door, for it is not meet to fortify the church."

The assassins now rushed in tumultuously, calling out, "where is the traitor? where is the archbishop?" Becket, who had ascended a few steps towards the choir, returned at this to meet them; saying, "here am I, the archbishop, but no traitor!"

One of them approaching cried out, "fly, you are a dead man!" "I will not fly." "Come hither, then," said the other, seizing him and striking off his cap with his dagger, "you are a prisoner!" "I will not come," replied the saint, withdrawing his robe from the sacrilegious grasp, "here you shall do to me what you will!" The assassin recoiled!

Then to Fitzurse, whom he saw advancing with his naked sword, he said, "What, Reginald! I have done thee many favors, and comest thou armed against me in the church?" "You shall quickly see," was the answer, "you are a dead man!" "And I," said the saint, "am ready to die, for my God, for justice, and the liberty of the Church. But, if you seek my life, I charge you, in the name of Almighty God, and under pain of anathema, hurt not one of my people. Let them be free from the penalty as they are of the offence. To me, and not to them should it be imputed, if they have embraced the cause of the suffering Church." Then interpreting their gestures, he added, "to God, to the blessed Mary, to the holy patrons of this Church, and the blessed martyr Dionysius, I commend myself, and the cause of the Church!" Fitzurse replied with a furious blow which nearly severed the arm of the faithful Edward Grim, who interposed to ward it, and reached the head of the primate, who fell upon his knees with eyes upturned towards heaven, and his hands clasped in prayer. A stroke from the second ruffian stretched him prostrate. The third laid open the greater portion of his scull, and the fourth, upbraided by his accomplices for tardiness, struck fiercely at the mangled head, and shivered his sword against the pavement,—fit emblem of the Church's triumph through her martyr's blood! Yet Hugh de Moreville, inserting his weapon into the gaping wound, scattered the brains about the floor! "He is dead," said they, "let us begone!"

And here the tale must close. The groan that rang through Christendom;—the murderers hiding from the curse of God and man;—their bitter penitence and signal deaths;—the fearful end of the chief contriver of their crime;—Henry's anguish and dismay;—his abrogation of the councils of Clarendon;—his bloody penance at the martyr's shrine;—the miraculous victory that crowned his arms at the instant he was rising from his expiatory prayer;—the wonders wrought by Almighty God at his faithful servant's tomb;—the piety that for ages heaped it with grateful offerings, till its wealth attracted a reformer's eye, and was sent to pamper a monarch's sensuality, while Cromwell burned and scattered to the winds those relics which yet shall shine for ever in the courts of the Eternal King,—all these, and many kindred topics, might be dilated on before an unexhausted auditory, but not mine.

I would detain you with but one consideration. To some of you, perhaps, my narrative has presented only an enthusiastic zealot, contending, with commendable firmness for what he believed to be right. But Becket was more. "He was freedom's champion." He stood for liberty, alone, when all beside him crouched at a despot's

heel. He alone dared meet a tyrant's mandate by pointing to a charter, and oppose the fury of innovation by the everlasting principles of truth and justice; and well has it been observed of him by a writer never partial, nor always fair,* had he been given to his country but a few years later, we should have seen him at the head of the barons, wresting at Runnymeade the great manumission deed of Englishmen from Henry's arbitrary son. Let not prejudice suggest that he only sought the substitution of ecclesiastical for political domination. The Church was, in his time, the only citadel of human rights known to our insular progenitors. That land which now gives law to half a world, had been trampled successively by Roman, Saxon, Dane and Norman; and the heterogeneous race, so foolishly miscalled, by eminence, the Anglo-Saxon, on whom each conqueror had branded his mark in turn, sat in bondage dark, unmitigated, Egyptian. The first faint beams of day were glimmering on the mountain tops, but night and vapor still submerged the plain. The great tenants of the crown, "the thousand small despots perched on their robber crags," had wrung some vague concessions from the fears or necessities of royalty; but the idea of popular liberty had no existence but as some half remembered, brilliant dream of childhood, in the recollections of the learned, or the traveller from distant lands. Prerogative swayed unresisted, and man's only asylum was within the walls of the convent, or under the sacred shadow of the Church. That Church, I quote the language of a native Protestant writer,† "labored with untiring zeal and perseverance, from the first century to the fifteenth, and successfully laid the foundations of all that society now is. During the greater part of that period, by means of its superior intelligence and virtue, it ruled the state, modified its action and compelled its administrators to consult the rights of man, by protecting the poor, the feeble, and the defenceless. It is not easy to estimate the astonishing progress it effected for civilization, during that long period, called, by narrow minded and bigoted Protestant historians, "the dark ages." Never before had such labors been performed for humanity. Never before had there been such an immense body as the Christian clergy, animated by a common spirit, and directed, by a common will and intelligence, to the cultivation and growth of the moral virtues, and the arts of peace. Then was tamed the wild barbarian, and the savage heart made to yield to the humanising influences of tenderness, gentleness, meekness, humility, and love; then imperial crown and royal sceptre paled before the crosier, and the representative of him who had lived, and toiled, and preached, and suffered, and died in obscurity, in poverty and disgrace, was exalted and made himself felt in the palace and in the cottage, in the court and the camp; striking terror into the rich and noble, and pouring the oil and wine of consolation into the bruised heart of the poor and friendless.

"Wrong, wrong have they been who have complained that kings and emperors were subject to the spiritual head of Christendom. It was well for man that there was a power above the brutal tyrants, called emperors, kings, and barons, who rode rough shod over the humble peasant and artisan; well that there was a power, even on earth, that could touch their cold and atheistical hearts, and make them tremble as the veriest slave. The heart of humanity leaps with joy, when a murderous Henry is scourged at the tomb of a Thomas à Becket; or when another Henry waits barefoot, shivering with cold and hunger for days, at the door of the Vatican; or when a Pope grinds his foot into the neck of a Frederic Barbarossa.

"Aristocratic Protestantism which has never dared enforce its discipline on royalty or nobility, may weep over the exercise of such power; but it is to the existence and exercise of such power that the PEOPLE owe their existence, and the doctrine of man's equality to man, its progress."

And an English Protestant,* commenting on the Pope's recent allocution against the outrages of the Russian autocrat upon

* Mr. Berrington.

† Boston Quarterly Review. January, 1842. Pp. 13, 14.

* London Morning Herald.

his Catholic subjects, exclaims with equal candor:

"We hail with gratification and with hope this appeal of the Roman Catholic Church against the injustice of Russia. It reminds us of the records of ancient days, ... in which we find, in ages termed by us dark, the appeal for justice ever made to the Church, the voice of the Church ever responding to that appeal, restraining the powerful, protecting the weak, and asserting in times of violence and danger, the supremacy of justice and right."

Such is the testimony of that liberality which dares to break the trammels of nursery prejudice, and seek historic truth beyond the magic circle of the primer! Such was the Church for whose vested rights the sainted Becket poured himself out like water! But to those who know her for the guardian of that better liberty wherein Christ hath made us free, he rises far above her Wallaces and Tells; and we gratefully respond to his commemoration in the liturgy of this day.

"Behold a great Prelate who in his days pleased God! There was none found like him in keeping the law of the Most High."

A. M. D. G.

Selected.

VIRTUE AND VICE.

I saw the virtuous man contend
With life's unnumbered woes,
And he was poor, without a friend,
Pressed by a thousand foes.

I saw the passion's pliant slave,
In gallant trim and gay;
His course was pleasure's placid wave,
His life a summer day.

And I was caught in folly's snare,
And joined her giddy train,
But found her soon the nurse of care,
And punishment and pain.

There surely is some guiding power,
That rightly suffers wrong;
Gives vice to bloom her little hour,
But virtue late and long.

ETERNITY.

Eternity! Eternity!
How long art thou, Eternity!
A moment's pleasure sinners know,
Through which they pass to endless wo:
A moment's wo the righteous taste,
Through which to endless joy they haste:
Mark well, O Man, Eternity!—Wülffer.

THE EPISCOPALIAN CHURCH A MODERN SECT.

Hear the Church; a sermon preached in the chapel royal, St. James' palace, June 17, 1838. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D. D. chaplain in ordinary to her Majesty. Second American from the fifteenth London edition. Burlington, N. J.*

HAVING shown what is meant by the Church, the queen's lecturer proceeds to exemplify it by what he calls an indisputable fact. Behold, then, gentle reader, the fact, and the doctor's reasoning upon it. "In this country there is at this time a religious society known by the name of the Church. The question is, when and by whom was this society instituted? Now the Roman Catholics, or Papists, assert that it was instituted and founded, like the generality of Protestant sects, by certain Reformers in the sixteenth century; and thence they would deduce a strong argument against us. They would ask us whether any man could take to himself the office of the ministry unless he be sent by God; and if we are spiritual Christians, if we take the Bible for our guide, if we act on that sound Protestant principle, with the fifth chapter to the Hebrews open before us, we must answer, no. They then proceed to ask, how can you prove that your ministers are called of God to the office? And if their assertion were true, that our Church was founded at the reformation, we could give them no answer at all."* It is not my province to defend the dissenting ministers in this review, against whom this quotation from the fifth chapter of the Hebrews is levelled. But the doctor ought to know, that the right of private judgment was established at the reformation as an indispensable and irrefragable principle. Without this, neither Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII, Cranmer, or any other reformer, could have accomplished their respective reformations. Up to that time the authority of the Church expressed and exercised, through the Roman pontiff, or a general council presided over by him or his representatives, was the rule of faith and essential discipline, according to the commission given to the pastors of the Church, "to feed and rule the Church of God," (Acts xx, 28): to teach and discipline all nations; "Going, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing, teaching them to observe all things *whatsoever* I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world!" (St. Matt. xxviii, 19, 20): "As my Father hath sent me, so I send you," &c. (St. John xx, 21): "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me." (St. Luke x, 16.) It is evidently upon this ground that all are obliged to "hear the Church," and that her decrees in matters of faith and essential discipline, have ever been paramount to private judgment, and imperative on the consciences of men. And, although the bishops of every national Church are appointed of God to feed and rule their respective Churches, it is in subordination to the general voice and authority of the whole body of the pastors of the Church Catholic. It is as much their duty to "hear the Church" as it is of the meanest of their flocks. It is true that as all points of mere

* At a time when such bold pretensions are put forth to names and things, which belong exclusively to the Church founded by the apostles, the review of Dr. Hook's sermon will be read with interest. It is from the pen of the Rev. J. A. Mason, a convert in England from Methodism to Catholicity, and we extract from it such portions as will establish incontestibly the proposition contained in the title of this article. The author clothes his ideas occasionally with rather too much of the ludicrous, which is probably attributable to the vividness of conviction with which he beheld and deplored the errors of Protestantism; but we recommend his observations solely for the able argument by which his point is sustained, and we trust that the over-facetiousness of the writer, if such it may sometimes appear, will be pardoned even by our dissenting friends.—[Ed.

* Hear the Church, p. 5, &c.

discipline would not be suitable to all nations, the bishops of a particular nation have a right to judge what parts of discipline that are not essential to the well being of the whole Church Catholic may be received or rejected; and hence the French Church does not receive every point of discipline ordained by Rome, nor are all points decreed by the council of Trent every where received. But such points as are essential to the integrity of the whole Church and her worship are every where of obligation. But the reformers of the English Church, like all the rest of the reformers, claimed the right of private judgment, and altered the faith and essential discipline of their Church according to their private judgment; so that the English Church was not like any other national Church in the world, and consequently not like the united Church Catholic. Nay they broke off from the centre of unity by which the Church Catholic was bound together in one, and thus ceased to be a member of the Catholic Church, and became at once heretical and schismatical. From that moment it was no longer a duty to "hear the English Church," but on the contrary a duty not to hear her. If, however, she had the right of private judgment to alter the faith and discipline of the body national, then Brown, and Penn, and Wesley, &c., have the same right to endeavor a counter reformation. And, were I a dissenting minister, I should soon dispose of the fifth chapter to the Hebrews. (Vide Dr. Clarke's comment on that chapter.) But Dr. Hook wishes to take root in the old Catholic Church of this kingdom. I have just shown that he cannot;* and I will now show it more fully, as it has been shown in a little work on the Church, as a monument, now in the press. The Christian religion is acknowledged by all professing Christians to be a divine revelation, a final and complete revelation. This religion may be comprised under the terms doctrine and worship. Now whatever is essential to the truth of doctrine and worship, was delivered by Christ to the Church with the design that it should be universally promulgated and established, and that it should endure through all generations to the end of time. Hence such is the form of the commission Christ, the wisdom of God, gave to his apostles, and such the promises he made to them. Knowing that as men they and their successors would be liable to error—knowing that the gates of hell would strive to prevail against them, he promises, who cannot lie or be deceived, that he will give the Holy Ghost to them to guide them into all truth, and that he shall remain with them for ever. Thus the unity, integrity, and perpetuity of truth is guaranteed to the Church by God himself; and guaranteed, not conditionally, like salvation to individuals, which depends upon their own fidelity to divine grace, but unconditionally, that all men in all ages may have the means of salvation in the Church established for this purpose. This unity and integrity of truth is essential to itself, essential to the design of its revelation, essential to afford the means of acquiring divine knowledge and saving grace for all nations

* Dr. Hook must himself know that the king was proclaimed at the reformation the fountain and source of all authority, ecclesiastical and civil; that in virtue of this authority the Church was established and modelled to his will; that no doctrine, canon or constitution of this Church could be of any force otherwise than as the king willed and decreed; that he could make and unmake bishops at his pleasure. Henry forbade the clergy to intermeddle with matters of religion without his authority for it, and they only durst complain that it was an encroachment on their privilege; just as if meddling in matters of religion was only a privilege and not a duty inherent in their apostolical and divine commission, if they had any. Under Edward the convocation of the clergy only petitioned of the parliament that no statute might pass concerning religion without their advice, but it could not be obtained. Soon after the king and privy council sent visiters into all parts of the kingdom with ecclesiastical constitutions and articles of faith. They required an express declaration from the bishops that they would teach only such doctrines as were established and explained by the king and clergy. But why require this of the bishops if they were the dictators of these doctrines? It is evident the word clergy is only inserted for form's sake, and regarded the faithless Cranmer (and perhaps Ridley), who was in all things the king's willing tool. After this came forth a mandate forbidding all teaching or preaching without the bishops' license; then the power of licensing was taken from the bishops and reserved to the king and Cranmer only; and, finally, all preaching was suspended throughout the kingdom till a form of faith silencing all controversy should come from the royal mint, and all persons were exhorted to receive with submission the orders that should be sent down to them. These are the *high and holy* grounds on which the claims of the Church of England rest.—*Review*, p. 19.

in all generations. And there is a mutual and correlative dependence between the unity and integrity of the faith and the unity and integrity of the Church, and *vice versa.* Once break the bond of faith, and the bond of the Church is broken directly; on the other hand, once break the bond of the Church, and a breach in the unity and integrity of the faith will soon follow. Now the unity of the Church is dependent upon unity of authority in the universal whole, and this unity of authority cannot be maintained without a centre of unity. Hence we come to the Pope at once, and must come to him; for if the scriptures had said nothing about St. Peter, or any other visible head, men might indeed have been at a loss as to the legitimate person (unless tradition had been strong enough to convince all men upon the subject, which can scarcely be supposed); but common sense would have appointed one, not a temporal king, but a pontiff, and would have enforced his authority. Protestants, therefore, have sinned as much against common sense in this particular as against a divine institution.* This being the nature of revealed truth, and the nature of a divinely appointed Church, there can be no independence of national Churches so far. Supposing St. Paul, or any other apostle, did preach the gospel in Britain, he could not establish an independent faith and Church; and the ancient British Church before or after the Saxon conquest could not be independent, as is evident from the very nature of the Christian compact. All that were converted were added to the Church, and it became a mountain filling the whole earth; and if any embraced the profession of Christianity without being added to the Church, no salvation was promised them,—"The Lord added to the Church such as should be saved." Thus there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one church, the body and spouse of Christ, the pillar and temple of truth. But supposing the English Church had its root in the ancient Catholic Church of this kingdom, it was not by being connected with the ancient British, but the ancient Saxon Church. The archbishop of Canterbury owns not St. David, but St. Augustine, as the founder of his see and of the English Catholic Church. We will now examine whether the present English Church has its root in the ancient Church of this kingdom. No one can deny that, *per accidens,* it has, inasmuch as if there had not been a Church there could have been no departure from the Church, or no pretended reformation of it; but, *per vinculum,* she has no more union with the ancient Church than the latter had with the ancient Druids, or the votaries of Woden. She has seized on ancient emoluments, and converted Catholic temples into Protestant churches; but this does not unite her to the Church she despoiled. Dr. Hook talks of bishops, priests, and deacons, and what they will do if driven into the caves of the desert; and no doubt he would be proud to acknowledge with Mr. Wesley, "that their bishops derive their orders from those bishops who received their episcopacy from the Roman Pontiff." But supposing they did, they have rejected the faith, for the protection and propagation of which that episcopacy was given, and which faith was held entire till the reign of Edward VI, and for the defence of which against the reformer Luther, Henry VIII received from the Pope the title *Defensor Fidei.* Now if this defence had not been true Popery, the Pope would not thus have rewarded him. But having afterwards cast off this faith, the English Church and clergy are condemned and excommunicated, not only by the Catholic Church but by the whole world. Neither Greeks, nor Latins, nor Copts, Syrians, Armenians or Nestorians will hold communion with them, or any other of the Protestant Churches.

Dr. Hook treats the word Protestant very shabbily; nay, he treats the whole offspring of the reformers, and the reformers too of all other reformed Churches, as if they were heretics and schismatics, calling them "Protestant sects," and evidently condemning them as to doctrine and discipline. He labors hard to wash out the blot of Protestantism from his Church; but finding it like an attempt to wash a negro white, very

* This many distinguished Protestants have admitted, as Leibnitz, Melancthon, &c.—Ed.

wisely desists, and rides off to St. James' palace to tell the queen and the nation that it is a nondescript thing, something like the manfish, found in the river Poick, that runs through the dark subterranean caverns of Adelsburg, supposed to be self-generating, and by the learned called proteus anguinus; a snake-like thing, in aspect somewhat human, but of varying form; and certainly the doctor might be farther from the mark. There is something subterranean about his Church; something amphibious; it has shewn itself a snake in human guise; its habits are protean, and it cannot bear the light. But let the doctor speak for himself. "I am come," says he, "to tell your majesty and the nation, that the Protestant Church of England is the old Catholic Church; though I confess it is not the whole, nor like any other branch throughout the world. Yet, as it is neither of the same faith nor the same discipline, nor united in itself in any one faith, nor joined in union with any other church, nor adhering to any one bond or centre of unity, except your majesty—and we can even be independent of you—therefore we must be the whole Catholic Church; for the Church is one, and we, differing from every body else, must be that one. And though the word Catholic, means universal, and our Church is not universal, yet it is no less the Catholic Church. I know it is called Protestant likewise; that is, protesting against every branch, and even the whole stock of the Catholic Church; but this does not alter the case—it is still the Catholic Church. I own I don't like the term Protestant, and have been long trying to wash this stain away; but I cannot, and therefore I have come to the conclusion that it is sometimes one and sometimes the other, and always both together. Yes, your majesty, I am bound, as a successor of the apostles, to tell you that our Church is both Catholic and Protestant! I hope the Holy Spirit is with me while I thus speak, and with you while you thus hear, that I may not give, and you not take offence!" I am sure that her majesty must have shook her head, and the reader of any reflection, will either button up his lips, or open them in the loud laugh. The English Protestant Church, the ancient Catholic Church! Why, it is no more like it than Dr. Hook is like a mermaid; she is much more like the proteus anguinus than the god-like form which Solomon delineates, and of which he has prophesied, "Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee;" and of whom St. Paul has said, "He has purchased to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

But I am not ignorant of the distinction between orders and missions. A church may have true orders, *i. e.*, the episcopal and priestly character, and, as such, apostolical succession, and thus be a continuation of the same national hierarchy, though it may fall into schism and heresy, or even be excommunicated: it is not so, however, as to jurisdiction, which flows from apostolical authority in the body of the Church Catholic, or its divinely appointed head, the Roman pontiff, and canonically exercised. Without this, there is no legitimate succession; and, therefore, although orders and succession may be preserved by regular ordination, they are lost, *de jure:* from the time a church falls into heresy or schism, that church, *de facto,* loses all lawful authority and mission; and if the canons are violated, orders are so far invalid, and the succession so far lost. Now it would not be difficult to prove that Cranmer's consecration even was canonically invalid, *ab initio,* from the protest he made before his consecration; but I shall not dwell upon this: certainly, from the schism of the English Church, all its authority and mission was unlawful, and more especially from the time of its excommunication. Still the main body of regular bishops existed till the reign of Edward VI, when the ordinal was altered; and all who were consecrated or ordained by that ordinal were neither bishops nor priests, as will be more fully shewn hereafter. In matters of faith and worship, Henry changed nothing except as related to the supremacy; he would allow no new sumpsimus in religion. Hence there was not that opposition that ought to have been by the clergy. They were divided on the subject of the divorce, and religion not being much outraged, their

loyalty got the better of their conscience; for the Catholic clergy are ever ready to cling to their prince as far as may be, and in this case they did so farther than conscience could justify. But all were not deterred by fear, or blinded by interest; all were not deceived by a shew of keeping up the Catholic religion by the Six Articles, when its head was gone, and its integrity left to the caprice of a monster's mind; all were not indifferent to the present, or unaware of the future. Many saw that the walls being broken down, and the keeper of the vineyard ejected from his charge, the wild beasts of the desert would revel in the spoil, and they dared to oppose the tyrant's will: the consequence was imprisonment, tortures, death. Among the numerous victims, we find a Fisher, bishop of Rochester, Sir Thomas More, lord chancellor, a Houghton, prior of the Charter House Monastery, who all perished in defence of the Church; the character of which men, especially the two former, was famed for learning, piety, and integrity, and is now held in esteem even by wise virtuous Protestants, and will ever be held in benediction by the children of the Catholic Church.

During this king's reign, the bishops and priests certainly were true bishops and priests, though many of them were not true men. This order continued, as I have said, to Edward's reign, during which the form of ordination was altered; the Catholic religion, as confirmed by the acts of Henry, abrogated; the new liturgy established; every doctrine and ancient practice annulled; and all things made to suit what had been done, and what they intended to do. And when the doctrine of the real presence and the sacrifice of the mass were discarded, the order of priesthood was not necessary; for where there is no altar,—no victim,—no sacrifice,—there is no office of priesthood remaining. Consequently, in the new ordinal or form of ordination, no priestly character or power was given. Still, many of the clergy, bishops, and priests, had been ordained by the old formula; these continued true bishops and priests, while the rest were neither the one nor the other. Dr. Hook boasts, as his brethren are wont to do, that the reformation of the Church was accomplished in due order by the bishops. It has been shewn that under Henry, all was done by the royal will, Cranmer being a ready tool for every purpose. That he had no conscience is evident; for, while a Protestant in his heart, he condemned Protestants to the stake, for the same principles he himself held, and afterwards professed; and, to please his royal master, and to preserve his emoluments and life, conformed to the Six Acts, taught transubstantiation, celebrated mass, administered communion in one kind, professed to live in celibacy, though he had privately married a wife, subscribed to the obligation of observing religious vows, the lawfulness of private masses, and the necessity of auricular confession; all which he disbelieved, and shook off as soon as the king was dead. No reformation, therefore, was made under this king, and consequently there was little for the conclave to do, and nothing they could do but yield or die. Under Edward, every thing was done by the royal will, at the suggestion of the courtiers and a few bishops in their interest. By these, the liturgy was reformed and pronounced, as I have said, to be the work of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Three years later, at the suggestion of foreign Protestants, Dr. Hook's sectarians, it was reformed again. Now the bishops objected, but Edward declared that, if they would not reform it, the new service should be freed from its blemishes without their assistance. Here, again, the royal will alone reformed the Church. The prelates who had known and believed the Catholic faith, though they had yielded too far, sat very uneasily under these changes, and Cranmer proposed to purge the Church of those whose disaffection was most notorious. Bonner, the bishop of London, was first selected. He told his accusers "he had three things—a few goods, a poor carcass, and a soul: the two former were at their disposal, the last was his own." He told them they were notorious heretics, and charged Cranmer with subserviency to men in power, and inconstancy in his religious principles. The next was Gardiner, bishop of Winchester; the third Heath, bishop of Worcester; the

fourth, Day, bishop of Chichester; the fifth, Tunstall, bishop of Durham. These prelates had been long imprisoned in the tower, and, after their trial, were kept in prison till the reign of Mary. The new doctrines mainly depended on the crown and its advisers; they did not take root in the country till power, fraud, the pulpit, and the press, and every species of penal law established them; and this every body knows. The clergy, for the most part, were hostile to them and the new liturgy, but were too much afraid of the penalties. If the church had been lawfully reformed by the bishops, according to the canons, there would have been no need of foreign auxiliaries; of kingly tyranny; of metropolitan hypocrisy, vacillation, force, and fraud; of legal proscription; imprisonment of bishops; dragooning of the clergy, and galling and ruinous penalties. A boy of ten years old could tell Dr. Hook this. In the midst of this ruin and confusion the boy Edward dies, and Mary comes to the throne. And now the sincerity of all the actors in the tragedy is brought to the test. Cranmer, who had bastardized the queen, divorced her mother, married and unmarried the king at his pleasure, and voted to death and signed the execution warrants of his wives, with a recklessness becoming a fiend of hell, now recants all, and is willing to be a Papist again, and say mass, and commit every other "abomination of Popery," providing he can save his life and emoluments; and, when he sees he cannot, then, and not till then, he acts the part, not of boldness and courage, becoming a good cause, as some, more superficial than wise, have said, but the part of a froward child, who hangs himself, or dashes out his brains for very spleen, when he cannot have his will.*

Thus the false guise of the man, which had marked him through life, covers his memory in death. Since I cannot be a Protestant archbishop, under a Protestant king, and Popish archbishop, under a Popish queen,—as I cannot be dictator, apostate, and traitor, alternately, when interest serves, I will seem a martyr, and repay the consistent caution of the queen with my latest malice. Thus died Cranmer, the fiend of earth, and the crown prince of hell. The duke of Northumberland appears next, and, when about to pay the forfeit of his treasons, he acknowledged to the spectators the justice of his punishment; declared that he died in the faith of his fathers, though, through ambition, he had conformed to a worship which his heart condemned; and prayed for the return of his countrymen to the Catholic Church. A proof that he knew they had left it, and that the Protestant Church was, *toto cœlo,* different from the Catholic. Now, however, all things were reversed, and the old Church and religion were re-established. The deprived and imprisoned prelates were reinstated in their sees, and the two houses of parliament acknowledge their sin, and beg pardon on their knees,—all which proves that it never entered into their heads, that the new religion was reformed legitimately, or that the Protestant Church was the same as the old Catholic Church; their consciences were awake, but their avarice for the plunder of the church was awake also. As soon as Mary was seated on the throne she of course released the bishops from the tower, but she did not force the Catholic religion on an unwilling people: she contented herself with asserting her right to have the Catholic worship performed in her own palace; but when the representatives of the nation returned to the Church, the bishops returned to their sees, except such as would not conform, and they were allowed to retire in peace, as Barlow and all the rest did, Cranmer not excepted. But the violence of the reformers, and seditious conduct of preachers, exciting the people to rebellion, made a different line of policy necessary. I need not pursue this subject farther than as a link in my argument; and this being sufficient, I pass to other points.

Dr. Hook reminds the queen, that, in the chapel of St. James' palace, "Young Edward imbibed the principles of divine truth from the lips of Ridley and Cranmer." Enough has been said, and whoever reads the history of Cranmer's career, will find that he was the last man to depend upon for principles of

* Macauley, the distinguished writer, and a Protestant, has drawn the same portraiture of Cranmer. See his *Miscellanies*, vol. i, p. 208, &c.—Ed.

any kind, much less those of divine truth. As to Ridley, he was not so base as Cranmer, but he was not a man of principle; for, during the reign of Henry, he conformed to all the theological caprice of that king; and, in Edward's reign he turned round to the new doctrine, and was one of those that pronounced the first composition of the Book of Common Prayer to be the dictate of the Holy Ghost, and its reformation, three years later, the dictate of the Holy Ghost. During the reign of Mary, however, these men perished: and nearly all the bishops consecrated by the old ordinal, returned to the Catholic Church; Barlow and Hodgskins did not. At the accession of Elizabeth all the Catholic prelates, except Kitchen, of Landaff, remained faithful, and were all removed from their sees and imprisoned, except Kitcken, who took the oath, and who was confirmed in his see. Hence it became necessary for the queen to provide a new hierarchy for her new Church. She applied to the old bishops to conform, and perform their functions in the new religion; but they all refused, and the queen resolved to supply their places by the exiles from abroad. Dr. Parker was fixed upon as metropolitan; but he was not a bishop, and must be consecrated, and four bishops were necessary for his consecration. But whence were they to be obtained, since only one lawful bishop was left?—he of Landaff! Again, in what manner was Parker to be consecrated? The ordinal of Edward was abolished by parliament in the last reign, and the Catholic ordinal renewed; this again was now abolished! and no lawful ordinal existed. Canonists and theologians were consulted, and they determined that the queen's authority as head of the church could supply every defect. Four personages were therefore appointed, viz: Barlow, who had been bishop of Bath, but was deprived of his episcopacy; Hodgskins, once suffragan of Bedford (both of whom are said to have been formerly consecrated according to the Catholic ordinal); and Scorey, the deprived bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale, the deprived bishop of Exeter, both of whom had been formerly consecrated according to Edward's ordinal; these four, without any jurisdiction, proceeded to confirm the election of Parker, and then consecrate him by Edward's ordinal. A few days afterwards Parker confirmed the election of Barlow to Chichester, and Scorey to Hereford; and then, taking these two as his assistants—for three were required by law—they confirmed and consecrated, by the same ordinal of Edward, all the other prelates elect. Thus they that required authority themselves, first consecrate and confirm an archbishop; and then the archbishop, thus confirmed and consecrated by men without authority, gives that authority to them, and, associating them to himself, consecrates all the other bishops of the kingdom; and they ordain the clergy. It may be asked, Why did not Kitchen, of Landaff, come forward? Whatever was the cause, he did not assist; it is said that he was applied to, and intended, but desisted at the warning voice of the Catholic archbishop. Perhaps he was not over anxious to go farther than he had done, for no doubt his conscience was not very easy at having taken the oath of the queen's supremacy; and, if he had assisted, it would not have rendered Parker's consecration more legally or canonically valid. The law required, for the consecration of an archbishop, an archbishop and two other bishops, or four bishops; and by bishops it did not mean deprived bishops, as Barlow, Scorey, and Coverdale were, or mere suffragans, as Hodgskins was; but bishops confirmed in their sees, having the office and jurisdiction of bishops.* Now, if Kitchen had been present as bishop consecrator, he would have been the only one acknowledged by law, and he not an archbishop, and the others had no jurisdiction. It is true there were four reputed bishops present, but two of these, viz. Scorey and Coverdale, were not bishops at all, they having been consecrated only by Edward's ordinal, which did not even give the character and power of

* All bishops are suffragans of their archbishop, but a mere suffragan is not bishop of a see, but one appointed to aid a bishop in his see, when that bishop has other high offices to perform in the state. The suffragan did not reside in the episcopal city, or take his title from it, but from some other town. Thus Bedford, Thetford, Leicester, Nottingham, and twenty-two other places were the seats of suffragans.

priesthood, and consequently could not give the episcopal character. There is also reason to doubt whether Barlow himself, the actual consecrator of Parker, was ever consecrated. He is known to have declared, that episcopal consecration was a needless ceremony, and that the king could make a bishop without it. Numerous writers of that time express their doubts of his consecration and declare that after diligent research, during eighty years, by persons interested, they could find no evidence or record of his consecration. His real episcopacy, therefore, rests on mere circumstantial indications, and on no positive proof, which is necessary to establish his right to consecrate at all, had all the other requisites existed; and, if Parker's consecration was illegal, it was equally contrary to the canons of the Church Catholic. 1st. These require the approbation of the metropolitan before a person can be made bishop. Now an archbishop's metropolitan is the patriarch, and the Pope is patriarch of the west, but I need not say the Pope's approbation was neither asked nor given. The council of Nice ordained this, and the English Church receives the decrees of that council; the canons of the apostles ordain the same, and she professes to be apostolical. 2d. The canons require the consent of the other bishops of the province, or a majority of them; but Parker's consecration was performed without the consent of all the bishops, or any of them, unless Kitchen consented, and excepting these four deprived bishops, two of whom were not in any sense bishops, they being ordained by a false ordinal. If Elizabeth herself had thought these men qualified, she would not have endeavored to persuade the old Catholic bishops to have consecrated Parker, and imprisoned them for refusing; yet she tried them all one by one, but they refused, and preferred a prison to so foul a deed.* Matthew Parker, however, was thus consecrated, and consecrated by Edward's ordinal. This of itself, had all other requisites been present, annuls his consecration. If there was no breach in the apostolical orders and succession before, this snaps the bond asunder. And the fact that, after his consecration by these men, he gave them their episcopal authority and institution, shews that they had them not when they consecrated him archbishop. Yet from this hocus pocus origin all the Protestant clergy derive their clerical character. There is no other link between them and the ancient Church than this diddle de doodle of an archbishop; and this same ordinal of Edward continued in full force and unaltered for 104 years, and might have continued till the present day, had not Erastius Senior, in 1662, induced the convocation then sitting to alter the form, by convincing them that it was insufficient to convey any priestly or episcopal character. But this alteration came 104 years too late to be of any service to them. If they have any succession of apostolical orders the chain must be entire; but from the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, until 1662 the bishops and clergy of the established Church were consecrated or ordained by Edward's ordinal; and all such as were ordained in Edward's time, were ordained by the same ordinal. Now this ordinal runs thus: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." The slightest glance at these words will convince any sensible man that they give no episcopal or priestly power; they are more applicable to the confirmation of the baptized than to the clerical character. It is true they may be addressed to a bishop or priest already consecrated or ordained, by way of exhortation, as St. Paul addresses them to Timothy; but they won't do for the purpose of giving the priestly character. We will now see how the altered form stands. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

* It is pretended by the authors of the Oxford tracts, that the bishops of Mary's reign were usurpers. Now these were really Catholic bishops, truly and validly consecrated by the ancient ordinal, and that before she came to the throne; how then could they be usurpers? and how came Elizabeth to solicit them to resume their functions in her new religion? It is evident she would not have called upon Barlow or Parker if these would have truckled to her will.

Ghost; and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by the imposition of our hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, love, and soberness." In like manner the form of ordaining the parsons is now altered, and is as follows: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Here the object is defined, and the Holy Ghost *professedly* imparted for a specific purpose of giving the character and office of a bishop or priest in the Church of God. And I direct the reader's attention to the looseness of the former ordinal, as a proof of the looseness of the ideas of the concoctors of the former ordinal respecting the character of a bishop or priest, and that it fully agrees with Barlow's assertion, that consecration was a useless ceremony, and a king could make a bishop by his royal license. And it was upon this principle that Barlow and the rest told the queen, that, as head of the church, she could supply every defect in Parker's consecration. Here, then, is the origin of the English Church: it has no root in the Catholic hierarchy, but is a fungus of Parker's dunghill; it is a new Church, teaching a new religion; a sect established by certain reformers in the 16th century: its ministers were not, and are not "called of God, as Aaron was;" and the assertion is true, that Dr. Hook's Church was founded at the reformation, *and they cannot answer the Catholics at all.*

TO BE CONTINUED.

THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH.

NO. III.

THE discussion between Bishop Whittingham and Rev. Mr. Johns, although it may be thought by some to turn upon a mere question of names, and to involve no discrepancy of opinion relative to the eucharist, has elicited a very dictinct assertion on the one side that the Christian minister is not "an offerer of sacrifice," and on the other that in the Christian sacrifice the body and blood of Christ are not truly and substantially present. It remains for us, therefore, to prove that the minister of Christ is an offerer of a sacrifice, properly so called, and that this sacrifice consists in the oblation of the body and blood of our Divine Redeemer. By establishing these two points we shall demonstrate fully that the Protestant Episcopal clergy have no claim whatever to the title of *priests*, because, as we stated in our last article, they do not offer the sacrifice instituted by our Saviour, and consequently their ministerial office is a mere phantom of the Christian priesthood: they have not the worship that belongs to the religion founded by Christ; therefore they are not priests or ministers of that religion.

That the subject may be better understood, we shall premise a few observations on the doctrine of the Church and the nature of sacrifice.

In the first place, the Catholic doctrine teaches, that the virtue and efficacy of the bloody sacrifice, in which Christ once offered himself to his Father on the altar of the cross, sufficed for cancelling the sins, not only of the people of that age, when he hung a victim on the cross, but likewise of all mankind, born into the world from the beginning to the end of time. For the Scripture saith: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself."* And again it saith: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who taketh away the sins of the world."† "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for *ours only*, but also for those of the

* 2 Cor. v, 19. † John i, 29.

whole world."* Now the world comprises persons not of one period only, but of all ages. Of this oblation, which alone sufficed for the reconciliation of the whole human race, the apostle Paul says: "For by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."† And again: "Because in him it hath well pleased the Father, that all fullness should dwell: and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven."‡ From this it is not to be inferred that there was not before, or is not now, any other sacrifice save that of Christ completed on the cross; but that of all the other sacrifices, this is the only one which appeases God by its intrinsic merit, and which may, therefore, be called, by antonomasia, the peculiar and pre-eminent sacrifice.

Secondly, the Catholic doctrine teaches, that, from the beginning of the world, when man lived under the law of nature, God impressed on the human mind, by means of divine inspiration, the rite of sacrificing; in order that all men might be made partakers of this most efficacious oblation, which has been now offered and accepted as the full, sufficient and entire price of the salvation of the world—and that they might transfer to themselves the saving fruits thereof. It also teaches that, immediately on the law being given, God ordained different sacrifices. The use of which was *not* to reconcile man to God, and purchase his salvation; but to awaken constantly within the mind of man, by means of these external sacrifices, the recollection of the *promised* sacrifice; to confirm his faith therein; and to enable such as should believe and hope in its virtue, to apply to themselves the fruit of the future sacrifice, whereby God had promised to redeem the world. Another object for instituting those sacrifices was, that, as often as they should be celebrated, man might gratefully call to mind the manifold favors bestowed on him by the unceasing liberality of God, and also reflect on his own salvation, which was to be obtained through the *promised* Redeemer.

In the law of Moses, there were three sorts of sacrifices; sacrifices of holocaust, eucharistical sacrifices and propitiatory and impetratory sacrifices. In the sacrifices of holocaust, the victim was entirely consumed, to show the sovereignty of God, and to impress on the mind of man a more lively idea of God's infinity. The eucharistical sacrifices were ordained in order to praise God for his favors and graces conferred upon his creatures. Lastly, the propitiatory and impetratory sacrifices were appointed to obtain pardon of God for our sins and other necessary blessings and graces men stand in need of. Now all these represented the great sacrifice of the new law, but the eucharistical sacrifices, in particular, were an admirable figure of it.

Though sacrifice in general is every rational, Christianlike, and moral act of man, whether internal or external, offered to God with the intention to worship him, the Supreme Being, prayer, praise, adoration, supplication, sorrow for sin, in a word, every thought, word, and deed, may be made a sacrifice to God. Still, sacrifice, in the proper sense and meaning, is an "external offering of some one or more things visible and perceptible, made to God by a lawful and duly appointed minister, attended with the destruction or change of the thing or things offered and sacrificed." By this destruction or total change, the sovereign and absolute power and dominion of God over man and the whole creation is acknowledged as to life and death, also his wisdom, and goodness, and mercy to man, and man's total dependence on God, his Creator and Sovereign Lord.

Hence, to effect properly a sacrifice, the act of offering, and the thing offered must be—

1. External and perceptible by the senses. Hence, acts, purely internal and occult, are not a sacrifice in the appropriate meaning.

2. The sacrifice must be made to God alone, for to him alone is sacrifice due and permitted to be offered. "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt

* 1 John ii, 2. † Heb. x, 14. ‡ Col. i, 19, 20.

thou serve."* "I the Lord, this is my name, I will not give my glory to another, nor my praise to graven things."† Wherefore, at no time did any man or set of men offer sacrifice except to God the Supreme Being; or, as the infidels did, to an object that they blindly and erroneously conceived to be the Supreme Being, and would set up and honor as such.

3. Sacrifice true and proper must be offered by a minister lawfully appointed to that purpose by a lawful ruler, divinely authorized and empowered to ordain and appoint the person to perform that ministry. "Do this for a commemoration of me," said Christ to his apostles, "and to no others."‡ "Neither doth any man take the honor of the ministry to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was."

4. The victim, or thing offered in sacrifice, must be either destroyed, or at least undergo some change.

Having laid down these principles, we shall proceed to establish our proposition that Christ instituted a sacrifice in the true sense of the word.

In the first chapter of the Prophet Malachy we read the following words: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun, even to the going down thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation, for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts."

In this text of the prophet, three things are conspicuous: 1. The pointed rejection of the ancient sacrifices, accompanied with a severe reproach of the Jewish priests: "I have no pleasure in you, and I will not receive a gift at your hands." 2. The substitution of a new and better sacrifice in their stead: "And in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean offering." 3. A plain intimation or prediction, that this one new and clean sacrifice should be offered in every place: "And in every place," &c.

But a Protestant may say with Calvin and Chemnitz, that we are to understand this sacrifice, not in the real and absolute meaning of the term, but only of a spiritual sacrifice. This, however, cannot be the case, for the prophet uses the same word *mincha* in both places (or, according to the Parkhurstian method, *menché*), where he speaks of the sacrifices rejected, and the new sacrifice to be instituted.

Besides, the word he uses is invariably found, in other parts of the Scriptures, to express the ancient sacrifices, properly so called; but, when the spiritual sacrifice of prayer and good works is mentioned, there occurs on every occasion an additional word, which either expressly, or by implication conveys the intended meaning. Again, how can this clean oblation, which was to be introduced in opposition to the sacrifices of the law, be understood of the performance of good works, when this latter kind of sacrifice, figuratively so called, had been already enforced in the strongest terms, both by the law and the prophets? Had not the Mosaic dispensation already required a love of God which was to regulate every faculty of the soul, and to control every action of the creature? Had not the prophets continually enforced the necessity of good works in the strongest and most energetic language? Is there a single virtue or perfection which can adorn the soul of a Christian to the attainment of which the most earnest exhortations may not be found in the immortal strains of David or in the venerable remains of the other prophets? How, therefore, can we, by any possibility, understand the promised oblation of the new law as referring to good works, when such works of every description had been before so powerfully recommended? The words of the prophet must then be understood of the great sacrifice of the new law, the mass.

The second scriptural passage which we shall adduce, is from the one hundred and tenth psalm, where we read this prediction relating to Christ the future Messiah: "The Lord hath sworn and he will not repent: thou art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec." St. Paul confirms this text in Hebrews (vii, 17).

* Matt. iv, 10. † Isaiah xlii, 8.
‡ Luke xxii, 20, and St. Paul, Heb. v, 4.

The apostle says, that he was not "called a priest according to the order of Aaron" (*Ibid.* 11), intimating of course that he would not offer sacrifices such as were prescribed by the Levitical law; but "according to the order of Melchisedec." Now of Melchisedec it is recorded in the Holy Scriptures that he offered sacrifice in bread and wine: "But Melchisedec, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him." (Abraham.)* If Christ, therefore, was to be a priest according to the order of Melchisedec, it is plain that he must have offered sacrifice with the same external symbols used by Melchisedec; namely, bread and wine. Now he did not offer in this manner upon the cross, but only at the last supper. In the eucharist, therefore, the eucharistical sacrifice is a true sacrifice offered by Christ, a priest according to the order of Melchisedec. Moreover, he was to be a priest forever, according to the same order, therefore he was to continue to offer sacrifice with the outward symbols of bread and wine; and this he cannot be said to do, but by the great sacrifice of the new law offered continually in his Church, Christ being always the great High Priest, thereof as well as the victim.

But let us refer to the very words of the institution. They unquestionably prove of themselves that he did offer a true sacrifice, and with the outward symbols of bread and wine. Our Saviour said, according to Luke (xxii, 19, Protestant version), "This is my body which is given for you," and 20, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.†" And St. Paul relates it in the Greek,‡ "which is broken for you." And St. Matthew has it, "this is my blood which is shed."§ Our blessed Saviour did, therefore, at the last supper, offer a real sacrifice of his body broken and his blood shed. For how can the body of Christ be said to be given for us, how can this sacred blood be shed for us, unless we understand this most sacred and solemn action as a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice? But, then, it may be said that there was a real offering of Christ before his offering on the cross, a real atonement before the real atonement of Calvary. I answer first, "The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world."* Secondly I refer to St. Matthew,† where we read, "And he was transfigured before them. And his face did shine as the sun; and his garments became white as snow." Christ is here transfigured and glorified in the days of his afflictions. If, therefore, Christ could be transfigured and glorified in the days of his patience and of his sorrowings, before his glory was consummated after his ascension, why, in like manner could not Christ offer himself in a mystical, but after a real manner, before that grand, and visible, and bloody offering on the cross, by which all things were consummated? See, kind reader, how faith and revelation lead us Catholics out of all the difficulties which sophistry, the fruit of a weak, yet arrogant reason, may throw in our way. But to return. When he uttered the ever memorable words, "this do in remembrance of me,"‡ he commanded his apostles, and in their persons the priests of his Church, to do the same; namely, to offer the same sacrifice with the outward symbols of bread and wine, in commemoration of him.

It may be objected that the present tense is, in the words of institution, used for the future; but even so, the text will only prove that as the real body was then offered under the appearance of bread, and the real blood under that of wine, in representation of the future bloody sacrifice upon the cross, so the words foretold, that the body should continue to be really offered under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, to the end of the world, in the unbloody sacrifice of the eucharist or the mass. For which reason nothing can be thence deduced against the reality of our Saviour's sacrifice at the last supper. It only differed from that of the cross, as our mass differs; namely, in the manner of offering."

* Gen. xiv, 18, 19.

† The Greek participle is undoubtedly in the present tense; but in the Syriac idiom, which was that used by the evangelist, the present participle is very frequently used in a future signification.

‡ 1 Cor. xi, 24. § Matt. xxvi, 28.

* Apoc. xiii, 8. † St. Matt. xvii, 2.

‡ Luke xxii, 19.

Were it necessary we might quote the sentiments of numerous fathers of the Church who lived in the early days of religion, and interpreted the scriptural passages avove cited, in the same sense which we have attached to them. They all allude to the eucharistic offering as a sacrifice, and make use of language which can only be applied to a true and real sacrifice. We shall mention only a few.

St. Justin, who wrote about fifty years after St. John the apostle, thus speaks of the *victims* which, he says, are everywhere offered among the Christian people. "These victims he (God) accepts from his own priests alone. Wherefore, shewing preference to all those who through his name offer the sacrifices which God ordained to be offered, that is, *in the eucharist of bread, and the chalice,* which in all places of the earth are celebrated by the Christian people, God declares that they are well pleasing to him," &c. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 209.

St. Irenæus, who flourished in the second century, is equally explicit on the subject. "Giving advice to his disciples, to offer their first fruits to God, not as if he stood in need of them, but that they might not seem ungrateful, he took bread into his hands, and giving thanks, said: *This is my body.* Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, *which oblation* the Church receiving from the Apostles, *offers it to God, over all the earth*—to him who grants us food—the first fruits of his gifts in the New Testament, of which the Prophet Malachias spoke: *I will not accept offerings from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a clean sacrifice.* Manifestly hereby signifying, that the first people (the Jews), will cease to offer to God; and that in every place, a sacrifice, and that clean, will be offered to him, and that his name is glorified among the Gentiles.* *Adv. Hær. Lib.* iv, *c.* xvii, p. 249. Therefore the offering of the Church, which the Lord directed to be made over all the world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God, and received by him; not that he stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but because he that makes the offering, if his gift be accepted, is thereby rendered worthy of praise. As then in simplicity the Church offers, her offering is accepted by God as a pure sacrifice. It is our duty to make an offering," &c. *See* p. 209. *Ibid. c.* xviii, p. 250, 251.

Tertullian, who wrote towards the end of the second century, frequently alludes to the eucharist as a sacrifice. At one time he declares that "*sacrifice is offered* for the preservation of the emperor" (*Lib.* ii, *ad scap. c.* 2); at another, that "women are not permitted to teach, baptize, or *to offer sacrifice* in the Church." (*Lib. de vel. virg. c.* 9.)

St. Cyprian, writing to the clergy and people of a certain district in Africa, laments that, contrary to an established rule, a brother clergyman had been appointed, by will, an executor or guardian, when it was the sole duty of the ministers of the gospel "to attend to the altar and sacrifices, and to prayers and supplications." Such likewise, he observes, was the view of the Almighty in the establishment by Moses of the Levitical order, and then adds: "The same disposition holds good now, that they who are promoted by clerical ordination, be not called away from the service of God, nor perplexed by worldly business; but, receiving aliment from their brethren, they withdraw not from the altar and from sacrifices, day and night intent on heavenly things." He next remarks, that, in a case like this, it had been decreed, that for no brother, who by will had made such a disposition, "any offering should be made, or sacrifice celebrated for his repose; because he merits not to be named at the altar in the prayer of the priests, whose wish it was to withdraw them from the altar."

* On this passage, the learned editor of Irenæus, Dr. Grabe, observes: "It is certain that Irenæus and all the Fathers—either contemporary with the apostles, or their immediate successors, whose writings are still extant—considered the blessed eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law, and offered bread and wine on the altar, as sacred oblations to God the Father; and that this was not the private opinion of any particular church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the Universal Church, which she received from the apostles, and they from Christ is expressly shewn in this place, by Irenæus, and before him, by Justin Martyr and Clement of Rome."—*Nota in Irenæum,* p. 323.

"In the priest Melchisedec we see prefigured the sacrament of the Christian sacrifice, the holy Scriptures declaring: *Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God, and he blessed Abraham.* (*Gen.* xiv.) And that he bore the resemblance of Christ, the Psalmist announces: *Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec.* (*Ps.* cix.) This order thus comes and descends from that sacrifice; that Melchisedec was the priest of the Most High; that he offered bread and wine; and that he blessed Abraham. And who was so much a priest of the most high God, as our Lord Jesus Christ? He offered sacrifice to God the Father; he offered the same as did Melchisedec,—that is, bread and wine; his own body and blood: and the blessing given to Abraham, now applies to our people. But, in the book of Genesis, that the blessing given to Abraham might be properly celebrated, the representation of the sacrifice of Christ, appointed in bread and wine, precedes it; which our Lord, perfecting and fulfilling it, himself offered in bread and wine; and thus he, who is the plenitude, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured image." *Ibid.* p. 105. He afterwards adds: "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his Father; and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him; then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did; and then offers in the Church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father, doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which was commanded be not faithfully complied with." *Ibid.* p. 109.

St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, mentions the various prayers and ceremonies which accompany our sacrifice of the altar, and adds: "When this spiritual *sacrifice* is ended, and this *unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation*, we supplicate God, for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted, and in a word, for all who want assistance. Again, when we offer this sacrifice, we commemorate those who have departed this world before us. We offer up that Christ who was sacrificed for our sins, propitiating him, who is so merciful, for them and for us." He proceeds to the Lord's prayer, which is recited in the mass, and dwells on its several clauses; and then prescribes the reverential manner, in which the body and blood of Christ are to be taken. *Catech. Mystag.* v, *n.* viii, ix, x, p. 327–8.—*See page* 218.

St. Ambrose, commenting on the appearance of the angel to Zacharias (*Luke* i), says: "It were to be wished that, while we burn incense on our altars, and offer sacrifice, the angel would assist, and become visible to us. That he does assist, cannot be doubted, while *Christ is there, while Christ is immolated. For Christ, our pasch, is sacrificed.*" (1 *Cor.* v, 7.) *L.* 1 *Evang. Luc. c.* 1. *T.* i. p. 1275.

In a letter to his sister Marcellina, giving an account of some disturbances at Milan, when an attempt was made to seize the Church, he relates: "The next day, which was Sunday, after the reading and sermon, when I was explaining the creed, word was brought that officers were sent to seize the Portian church, and that part of the people were flocking thither. I continued to discharge my duty, and began mass: but as I *was offering*, I was informed that the people had laid hands on an Arian priest. This made we weep, and I prayed to God in the midst of the offering, that no blood might be shed in this quarrel." *Ep.* xiv, *Classis* i, *T.* 11, p. 853. Having heard from the Emperor Theodosius of the victory which he had gained over the tyrant Eugenius, Ambrose writes to him: "I took your letter with me to the church: I laid it on the altar, and, whilst I *offered sacrifice*, I held it in my hand, that by my voice you might speak, and your august letter perform with me the sacerdotal office." *Ibid.* p. 1021.

As the *mass* has just been mentioned in a quotation from St. Ambrose, I will here subjoin a passage, on the subject, from the learned and pious Cardinal Bona, who flourished in the seventeenth century. "There is an epistle of Pius I, acknowledged to be genuine, written about the year 166 to the

bishop of Vienne, in the opening of which he thus speaks: 'Our sister Euprepia, as you well recollect, made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate mass.'" *Conc. Gen. T.* 1, p. 576. A letter also from Pope Cornelius to another bishop of the same city, written about the year 254, remarks that, on account of the persecutions, the Christians could not publicly "celebrate mass." *Ibid.* p. 681. In the fourth century, St. Ambrose, writing to his sister, mentions the mass, as likewise in his thirty-fourth discourse: "I exhort you, you that are near the Church, and can do it without great inconvenience, to hear mass daily." *T.* 2, *in Append.* p. 425. In his preparatory prayer before mass, he says: "Grant me thy grace, on this day and on every other, with a pure mind and clean heart, to celebrate the solemn service of mass."* *Ibid.* p. 335. "St. Augustin and other ancient fathers use the same expression, and they use it as if it were common and generally received at the time." *L. Rerum Lit. c.* iii, p. 17. *Edit. Paris*, 1678.

In this fourth century various councils were held, which in plain terms speak of the Christian sacrifice.

The council of Ancyra,† against such priests who, in the times of persecution, had shewn great weakness, enacts: "That they be not deprived of their stations; but that they be not allowed to *offer*, nor to address the people, nor to perform any priestly functions." *Can.* 1. *Conc. Gen. T.* 1, p. 1455.

Council of Neocæsarea.‡ "Country priests, in the presence of the bishop or priests of the city, cannot *offer*, nor give the sanctified bread, nor present the chalice." *Ibid. Can.* xiii, p. 1483.

Council of Nice. "The holy synod has been informed, that, in some places and cities, the deacons present the eucharist to the priests; a thing which no canon nor custom has taught—that they, who have themselves no power to *offer*, should present the body of Christ to those who possess that power." *Can.* xviii, *Conc. Gen. T.* ii, p. 38.

The council of Laodicea,* having established certain rules to be observed in the service of the Church, adds: "And after the priests have given the kiss of peace to the bishop, the laity must do the same one to the other, and thus the holy *offering* be completed: but the ministers alone may approach the altar, and there communicate." *Ibid. Can.* xix, *T.* i, p. 1499.

The second council of Carthage† enacts, that if any priest, having been reprimanded by his bishop, withdraw from his communion, and "offer sacrifice privately," erecting altar against altar, contrary to established discipline, he be deprived of his office. *Ibid. Can.* viii, *T.* p. 1161.

We might add innumerable other passages from the fathers, but those which we have quoted will suffice to show what was the faith of the primitive ages, concerning the sacrifice of the new law. The language which these early writers use, the words *sacrifice, victim, immolation, altar*, &c., are plainly indicative of the belief that in the eucharista true sacrifice was offered to God.

The same truth is gathered from the ancient liturgies which have been transmitted to us; those of St. James, St. Clement, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, all of which contain expressions which show evidently, that in the eucharist a real sacrifice was offered to God. Hence Calvin has not hesitated to declare, that the ancients cannot be excused for having "imitated rather the Israelitic mode of sacrificing, than the form ordained by Christ."‡ Who was a better witness of what Christ ordained; Calvin, who came to light in the sixteenth century, or Clement, the disciple of St. Peter, with SS. Cyril, Basil, Chrysostom, &c., who flourished twelve hundred years before Calvin made his appearance?

* The two works quoted by Cardinal Bona, as the works of St. Ambrose, are not allowed, by the learned, to be his, though of some ancient author.

† This council, held about the year 314, consisted of bishops from all the principal sees of the east, to the number of at least 118. They enacted twenty-five canons for the establishment of discipline.

‡ This council was called soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted of nearly the same bishops.

* This council met about the end of the fourth century, (in 396 or 399), and has left us sixty canons, which have ever been held in the greatest estimation.

† This council was called by Genethlius, bishop of Carthage, who presided at it, in 390. It enacted thirteen canons, respecting the celibacy of bishops, priests and deacons, and other points of discipline.

‡ Inst. Lib. iv, c. xviii.

We will here quote the words of the liturgy of St. James. This liturgy is called also that of Jerusalem, and the substance of it may be traced to St. James, its first bishop. It is the most ancient of all the liturgies, and has been commonly used in the Churches of Syria. In the judgment of able critics, it is the liturgy which St. Cyril of Jerusalem explained in his *Catecheses.* "Have mercy on us, O God! the Father Almighty, and send thy Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, equal in dominion to thee and to thy Son—who descended in the likeness of a dove on our Lord Jesus Christ—who descended on the holy apostles in the likeness of tongues of fire;—that, coming, he may make this bread, the life-giving body—the saving body—the heavenly body—the body giving health to souls and bodies—*the body of our Lord, God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ,* for the remission of sins, and eternal life to those who receive it. Amen. And may make what is mixed in this chalice, *the blood of the new testament*—the saving blood—the life-giving blood—the heavenly blood—the blood giving health to souls and bodies—*the blood of our Lord, God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ,* &c. Amen. Wherefore, we offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and *unbloody sacrifice,* for thy holy places which thou hast enlightened by the manifestation of Christ, thy Son, &c. *Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalum Collectio, T.* ii, *pp.* 33, 34. *Paris,* 1716. Grant thy blessing, O Lord, again and again, through this *holy oblation* and *propitiatory sacrifice* which is offered to God, the Father; is sanctified, completed, and perfected by the descent of the Holy Ghost."

In vain would it be objected that the language of the fathers and the liturgies alludes to the spiritual sacrifice of prayer, thanksgiving, &c., which accompanies the celebration of the eucharist. For they speak of a sacrifice which can be offered only by the priests of the Church, and consequently do not refer to that offering of prayer, &c., which is made by all, whether clergy or laity. Moreover it cannot be supposed that language as explicit as that of the liturgy and fathers just quoted, was ever applied to sacrifices in an improper sense.

We gather from the very name by which the officiating minister in the eucharistic rite has always been designated, that he offers a true sacrifice. The language of the Greek Church styles him ἱερεὺς, that of the Latin Church, *sacerdos;* words which in English are rendered by the term *priest,* and have been used from the very origin of Christianity, to express a minister of Christ. That in the New Testament the words ἱερεὺς and *sacerdos* were not used to designate the priests of the new law, is easily accounted for, by the necessity under which the sacred writers were, for the sake of distinction, of using terms different from those which were universally applied to the Jewish priesthood and sacrifices. But when the Hebrew rites were abolished, by the destruction of Jerusalem, the ecclesiastial writers immediately subsequent to that period, adopted the use of the words ἱερεὺς and *sacerdos.* Polycrates tells us that St. John, the apostle, wore the pontifical *lamina,* and performed the functions of a priest; Tertullian, *De Præscrip.,* Dionysius, in his *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia,* St. Cyprian, in his Epistles, and innumerable others make use of the same term.

Bishop White (Protestant), very illogically observes that, if the inspired authors of the New Testament avoided the use of this word for the reason we have mentioned, "it is strange that the apostolic age should have passed away, without any either scriptural hint or tradition of the change that was to take place, on the destruction of the Jewish polity." But we do not perceive how the absence of testimony on this point, should be more strange than in reference to the abolition of the law, which was enacted by the apostles, regarding abstinence from blood and things strangled, and which was abrogated at a later period. One thing however *is* strange, that while the language of ecclesiastical antiquity proclaims the doctrine of a sacrifice, in the eucharistic institution, modern sectarists should undertake to assert that it is an error to acknowledge such a sacrifice.* W.

* For the substance of this article we have consulted principally *White's Confutation of Church of Englandism, Butler's Lectures,* and *Faith of Catholics.*

CEREMONIES OF HOLY WEEK AT ROME.

NO. III.

RELIGIOUS VIEW OF THESE FUNCTIONS.

AFTER having employed three discourses upon the less important considerations, it may seem but little proportioned to the relative value of things, that, into one, I should endeavor to compress whatever regards the main purpose of them all. For you have not forgot, I trust, that I reserved to this my last discourse, to treat of the offices and ceremonies of Holy Week in a religious point of view; or, as I explained myself, to consider them "as intended to excite virtuous and devout impressions."

These two epithets must not be considered as inadvertently placed; for they represent two divisions of my subject, and consequently of my discourse. I consider the one as expressive of the external, and the other of the internal, influence of these institutions. Virtue is, indeed, an inward principle, but strongly regulates our relations with others; devotion is a feeling of whose extent and intenseness God and our own souls can alone be conscious. Virtuous conduct may be noticed in communities or masses of men; while devotion is properly an individual possession. I will endeavor to show how both have been, and may be, nourished by the solemn and detailed commemoration of next week.

Who shall gainsay, that men are powerfully acted on by formal and external acts that represent inward feelings, although even the latter be not excited? In times of bloody, and often causeless, strife, who knows not, that homage and fealty, solemnly given, bound men often to loyalty and liege bearing, more almost than principle? It was not perhaps, sometimes, that the proud baron, or the monarch, who held a fief, felt much the religious obligation of an oath; it was not that they feared punishment for its violation, but there was a solemn force in the very act of homage, in the placing of hand within hand, and plighting faith upon the bended knee, and with the attendance of a court.

Far more worth than all this circumstance, would have been a stronger inward conviction of obligation; but such is man, that the determinations of his fickle heart require some outward steadying by formal declarations. Who knows not, how much the coronation ceremony has done for fastening the crown upon the heads of kings; how the pretender to a nation hath fought bloody battles to have it done on him in the proper place; and how maidens have fought with knightly prowess, that the rightful owner should, in his turn, receive it? And has not the wavering fidelity of subjects been secured by the fear of raising a hand against God's anointed? And in all this, which is not of divine or scriptural institution, who sees anything less than wholesome, as conducing to the strengthening of sentiments in themselves virtuous and publicly useful?

In some respects similar is the institution of a season set apart for outwardly exhibiting those feelings, which should ever animate the Christian soul towards his crucified Redeemer. It must be greatly conducive to public virtue, to appoint a time when all men, even the wicked, must humble themselves, and act virtue. It is a homage to the moral power, an acknowledgment, at least, of its right to rule; a recognition of a public voice in virtue, which can stand on the highway, and command even her enemies to obey her laws. It is, moreover, a compulsion to thought: many a virtuous life hath been led in earnest, whose beginning had been in mockery and scorn. You have always gained much upon the soul, when you have brought the behavior to what becomes it. Now, all this hath the setting aside one week to the commemoration of Christ's passion effected; because being not merely proposed to the mind, but represented

in such a way as to oblige men to attend, with certain proprieties of deportment, and acting moreover on the public feelings of society, it produces a restraint and a tone of conduct which must prove beneficial. But examples will illustrate this better than words.

St. Bernard clearly intimates, that the most abandoned, and even those who had no idea of an effectual reform, were yet compelled, by public decency, to abstain from vice during the entire Lent, and more especially during the concluding season. "The lovers of the world," he exclaims, in his second sermon on the resurrection, "the enemies of the cross of Christ, through this time of Lent, long after Easter, that they, alas! may indulge in pleasure. Wretches! thus honor ye Christ whom ye have received? Ye have prepared a dwelling for him at his coming, confessing your sins with groans, chastening your bodies and giving alms, and, behold, ye traitorously betray him, or force him to go out by readmitting your former wickedness. Now, should Easter require less reverence than Passion-tide? But it is plain that ye honor neither. For if ye suffered with him, ye could reign with him; if with him ye died, with him ye would rise again. But now, only, from the custom of this time, and from a certain similation, hath that humiliation proceeded, which spiritual exultation followeth not."* He then exhorts all to perseverance in the course of virtue which they had assumed. But it is evident, from these words, that the scandal of vice was arrested by the public solemnization of this time.

It has been the custom, too, during these days, consecrated by the remembrance of Christ's passion, for sovereigns to lay aside their state, and proclaim, before their subjects, the equality of all men when viewed upon Mount Calvary. When the Emperor Heraclius recovered from king Chosroes the relics of Golgotha, and bore them himself in triumph to the holy city, old historians tell us how, arrived at the gate, he found himself, of a sudden, unable to proceed. Then the patriarch, Zachary, who was beside him, spoke to him saying, "You are bearing the cross shod and crowned, and clad in costly robes; but He who bore it here before you, was barefoot, crowned with thorns, and meanly attired." Upon hearing which words, the emperor cast aside his shoes and crown, and all other regal state, and entered the city to the Church.

The spirit of this reproof was fully felt in later times through every Christian country. In many, no one is allowed to go in a carriage during the last days of Holy Week; at Naples this is yet observed, and the king and royal family, for that time, are reduced, as to outward pomp, to the level of their subjects. "Now," says a modern German author, speaking of Lent, "the songs of joy gave place to the seven penitential psalms; the plentiful board was exchanged for strict temperance, and the superfluity given to the poor. Instead of the music of the bower and hall, the chaunt of 'Miserere' was heard, with the eloquent warnings of the preacher. Forty days' fast overcame the people's lust; kings, princes, and lords were humbled with their domestics, and dressed in black instead of their gorgeous habits. In Holy Week, the mourning was still more strongly expressed; the Church became more solemn; the fast stricter; no altar was decorated; no bell sounded, and no pompous equipage rolled in the streets. Princes and vassals, rich and poor, went on foot, in habits of deep mourning. On Palm Sunday, after reading out of the History of Christ, every one bore his palm, and nothing else was heard but the sufferings of the Messiah. After receiving the blessed sacrament on Maundy Thursday, bishops, priests, kings, and princes, proceeded to wash the feet of the poor, and to serve them at table."*

In the life of that most amiable and holy princess, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, we have the following account of her practices during these days: "Nothing can express the fervor, love, and pious veneration, with which she celebrated those holy days, on which the Church, by ceremonies so touching, and so expressive, recalls to the mind of the faithful, the sorrowful and unspeaka-

* De Resurr. Dei, Ser. ii, page 168: Par. 1602.

* "Vogt Rhenische Geschichte," ap. Digby Morus, p. 170.

ble mystery of our redemption. On Holy Thursday, imitating the King of kings, who, on this day, rising from table, laid aside his garments, the daughter of the king of Hungary, putting off whatever could remind her of worldly pomps, dressed herself in poor clothes, and, with only sandals on her feet, went to visit different churches. On this day, she washed the feet of twelve poor men, sometimes lepers, and gave to each twelve pieces, a white dress, and a loaf.

"All the next night she passed in prayer and meditation upon our Lord's passion. In the morning, it being the day on which the divine sacrifice was accomplished, she said to her attendants: 'This day is a day of humiliation for all; I desire that none of you do show me any mark of respect.' Then she would put on the same dress as before, and go barefoot to the churches, taking with her certain little packets of linen, incense, and small tapers; and, kneeling before one altar, would place thereon of these; and, prostrating herself, would pray awhile most devoutly, and so pass to another altar, till she had visited all. At the door of the church she gave large alms, but was pushed about by the crowd, who did not know her. Some courtiers reproached her for the meanness of her gifts, as unworthy of a sovereign. But though, at other times, her alms-deeds were most abundant, so that few ever were more splendidly liberal to the poor, yet a certain divine instinct in her heart taught her, how, in such days, she should not play the queen, but the poor sinner for whom Christ died."*

Every one will feel what an influence such annual seasons of humiliation in sovereigns must have exercised on the formation of their own hearts, and, through them, on the happiness of their subjects. But no one either, I believe, will fail to notice the connexion established, by the biographer, between the touching ceremonies of these days and the conduct of this princess, as of many others. Had there been no special commemoration, day by day, and almost hour by hour, of our Saviour's actions and sufferings; had there not been services, which especially separated them from all other days, for this solemn occupation; and had they not been such as bring the feelings of men into harmony with the occasion, indeed such instances of royal abasement never would have been witnessed. Nor is this thought and practice far from your own age and place; if, on the evenings of Wednesday and Thursday, you will visit the hospital of the pilgrims, you will see the noblest of Rome, cardinals, bishops, and princes, performing the lowest works of hospitable charity on the poor strangers who have arrived from afar. Washing and medicating their galled feet, and serving them at table; while dames, of highest degree, are similarly ministering to the poor of their own sex. And here you will see, I promise you, no coldness, or precise formality, as though it were an unwilling duty; but, on the contrary, an alacrity and cheerfulness, a familiarity and kindness, which proves it to be a deed of charity done for Christ's sake, and in example of the humble and suffering state to which he reduced himself for us. And the relation between this uninterrupted continuation of old charitable hospitality, and the similar action of our Saviour, commemorated in the Church ceremonial, will sufficiently prove the influence which this has in keeping up an exercise so accordant with his precept.

But the effects of these solemnities were more conspicuously useful, inasmuch as they suggested an imitation not only of our Saviour's abasement, but still more of his charity. I will not detain you to quote the authorities of eminent writers, to show how this week was ever distinguished by more abundant alms and works of charitable actions. I will content myself with instances of the influence it had in one rarer and more sovereign exercise of this virtue. There is a well known anecdote of a young prince, who, being yet in tutelage, besought in vain of his council the liberation of a prisoner; wherefore, going into his room, he, with an amiable peevishness, opened wide the cage of certain singing birds, which he kept for his pastime, saying, "If I cannot free any other prisoner, no one can prevent my free-

* Count Montalembert, p. 67.

ing you." With a better spirit, but with an innocence of thought no less amiable, it seemed a rule to expiate the crime of Pilate and the Jews, in unjustly condemning our Lord, by freeing captives on these days from their bonds; and in this manner did it rightly seem to Christian souls, that the liberation of man from eternal captivity was most suitably commemorated.

This practice began with the earliest emperors. "Not only we," says St. Chrysostom, in his excellent homily on Good Friday, "not only we honor this great week, but the emperor, likewise, of the entire world. Nor do they do it slightly and formally, but they grant vacation to all magistrates, that, free from cares, they may employ these days in spiritual worship;—let all strife and contention, they say, now cease;—as the goods which the Lord purchased belong to all, let us, his servants, strive to do some good also. Nor by this only do they honor the time, but in another way also; and that no less excellent. Imperial letters are sent forth, enacting that the prisoners' chains be loosed; that, as our Lord, descending into hell, freed all there detained from death, so his servants, imitating as much as may be their master's clemency, may free men from sensible bands, whom they cannot free from spiritual."*

The imperial law encouraged, likewise, private individuals to imitate, as far as possible, this practice of sovereign clemency. For Theodosius prescribed that, while every other judicial act should cease during Holy and Easter week, an exception should be made in favor of all such acts as were necessary for the emancipation of slaves.† St. Gregory of Nyssa mentions this practice of manumission to have been a frequent manner of honoring the season commemorative of our Lord's death and resurrection.‡ At a late period, St. Eligius, the friend of Dagobert, says in a homily on Maundy Thursday, "Malefactors are pardoned, and the prison gates are thrown open throughout the world. Later, the kings of France used to pardon, on Good Friday, one prisoner convicted of some crime otherwise unpardonable; and the clergy of Notre Dame, on Palm Sunday, used to liberate another from the prison of the Petit-Chatelet. Howard informs us, that "in Navarre, the viceroy and magistrates used to repair twice a year to the prisons, at Christmas and eight days before Easter, and released as many prisoners as they pleased. In 1783, they released thirteen at Easter; and some years before they released all."* This shows that the indulgence was not injudiciously granted, but after a proper investigation.

But still more useful was the influence of mercy, in accordance with the lessons of this time, and the example of our Saviour, when it served to temper personal and deadly hatred, such as feudal strife was too apt to engender. When Roger de Breteuil had been condemned to perpetual imprisonment, for conspiracy against William the Conqueror, the historian tells us, that when the people of God were preparing to celebrate the festival of Easter, William sent to him in prison a costly suit with precious furs. And, again, when Duke Robert was besieging closely a castle wherein his enemy, Balalard, had taken refuge, it happened that Balalard's clothes were much worn; whereupon he besought the duke's son to supply him with all that was necessary becomingly to celebrate Easter; so the young nobleman spoke to his father, who ordered him to be provided with new and fair apparel.†

When an ancient writer, speaking of the enormous crimes of Gilles Baignart, tells us, that he could not have obtained pardon "not even on Good Friday," methinks such an expression speaks more powerfully than a volume of instances, on the pleading for mercy, which the solemnity of that day was supposed to make. It seems to say, that a man's evil deeds must have been almost fiendish, for pardon to have been refused when asked on that day. What a beautiful commentary on the expression does the history of St. John Gualbert make. His only brother, Hugo, had been slain by one whom the laws could not reach. John was young and passionate, and his father urged him to

* De Cruce, tom. 5, p. 540: ed. Savill.
† Cod. Justin. lib. iii, tit. 12 de Feriis.
‡ Hom. iii, De Resurrect. Christi.

* Digby, "Mores Cath." b. iii, p. 87. † Ibid.

avenge the murder, and wipe off the disgrace of his family. It was in the eleventh century, when such feuds between noble families were not easily quenched; and he determined to do the work of vengeance to the utmost. It so happened that, on Good Friday, he was riding home to Florence, accompanied by an esquire, when, in a narrow part of the road, he met his adversary alone, so that escape was impossible. John drew his sword, and was about to despatch his unprepared foe, when he, casting himself on his knees, bade him remember that, on that day, Jesus Christ died for sinners, and besought him to save his life for His dear sake. This plea was irresistible. To have spilt blood on such a day, or to have refused forgiveness, would have been a sacrilege; and the young nobleman not only pardoned his bitter enemy, but, after the example of Christ, who received a kiss from Judas, raised him from the ground, and embraced him. And from that happy day began his saintly life.

All this was in conformity with what the Church, in the office of that day, inculcates by example. For, whereas it is not usual publicly to pray, in her exercises, for those who live not visibly in her pale (although she encourages her children at all times to make instant supplication for them), on that day she separately and distinctly prays for them, not excluding any order, even of such as treat her like an enemy; but striving to make her zeal and love as boundless as her Master's charity. Nothing, surely, but the inculcation of this feeling, or rather the making it the very spirit of that day's solemnity, could have given it such a might in gaining mercy. Hear, again, how wonderfully the precept of receiving the holy communion, at this same season, worked effects of charity. When the good king, Robert of France, was about to celebrate Easter at Compiegne, twelve noblemen were attached of treason, for designing to assassinate him. Having interrogated them, he ordered them to be confined in a house, and royally fed; and, on the holiday of the resurrection, strengthened with the holy sacrament. Next day, being tried, they were condemned; but the pious king dismissed them, as his historian says, on account of the benign Jesus.*

Surely, when such effects as these were produced, by the observance of a holy season thus set aside for the commemoration of Christ's sacred passion and resurrection, no one will deny that this must be a most wise institution, as a cause and instrument of great public virtue. And the power, which it had and hath, must not be disjoined from the exact forms which it then, as now, observed. For, manifestly, these days would never have received consecration in the minds of men, nor have been thought endowed with a peculiar grace, if nothing had been acted on them that distinguished them from other times. In countries, where no mark seals them with a blessed application, they slip over like other days. Good Friday, alone, detains, for a brief hour, the attention of men to the recital of our Redeemer's dolorous passion; but how faint must be the impression thus produced, compared with that of a sorrowful ceremonial, which, step by step, leads you through the history of this painful event, pausing, as if to look upon each distinct act of graciousness, and to commemorate each expression of love, and to study every lesson of virtue! And, indeed, how powerful this influence was, the effects I have described must show.

Nor must it be thought for a moment, that they resulted rather from custom than from feeling; as though kings and princes were not likely to assist with much earnestness at these ceremonies, but rather left them to be performed by priests in their churches or chantries. On the contrary, they would have greatly shocked their subjects had they neglected due and respectful attention to these ecclesiastical offices. When the pious emperor, Henry II, was returning from Rome, where he had been crowned, he staid his journey at Pavia, that he might celebrate Easter; and so our own and foreign chronicles often record the place where the holydays were passed. Rymer has preserved a writ of Edward III, commanding the ornaments of his chapel to be sent to Calais,

* Helgaldus Epit. Vitæ Rob. p. 64, Hist. Franc.

where he meant to keep the festival.* Abbot Suger has given us a minute account of the magnificent way in which the kings of France used to observe the sacred time in the Roman style, as he expresses it. On Wednesday, the king proceeded to Saint Denis, met by a solemn procession. There he spent Thursday (on which the ceremonies were performed with great magnificence), and all Friday. The night of Easter-eve he passed in Church; and, after privately communicating in the morning, went in splendid state to celebrate the Easter festivity.†

It may be, perhaps, objected, that the impression thus made by a few days of devotion and recollection, must have been very transient, and can have produced no permanent effects. This, however, was far from being the case. For the Church, with a holy ingenuity, was able to prolong the sacred character of these days throughout the year; and to make the lessons we have seen taught by them enduring and continued. Every one, I presume, is aware, that Sunday is but a weekly repetition, through the year, of Easter day; for the apostles transferred the sabbatical rest from the last to the first day of the week, to commemorate our Lord's resurrection. Now, a similar spirit consecrated, from the beginning of the Church, the sixth day of every week as a day of humiliation, in continued remembrance of the day whereon he was crucified.

From the beginning, Friday was kept as a fast, and that of so strict observance, that the blessed martyr, Fructuosus, bishop of Tarracona, in Spain, when led to execution, in 259, though standing much in need of refreshment, refused to drink, it being Friday, and about ten of the clock.‡ The motive for this fast, as well as of that on Saturdays, the remains of which yet exist in the observance of these two days as days of abstinence, is clearly stated to be what I have described it, by Pope Innocent I, about the year 402. For, writing to Decentius, he says: "On Friday we fast on account of our Lord's passion. Saturday ought not to be passed over, because it is included between the sorrow and the joy of that season. This form of fasting must be observed every week, because the commemoration of that day is ever to be observed."* Julius Pollux, in his Chronicle, says of Constantine: "He ordered Friday and Sunday to be honored; that on account of the cross (or crucifixion) of Christ, and this for his resurrection."

In after ages this custom was rigidly observed, as a learned and pious living author has proved by examples. In an old French poem upon the Order of Chivalry, Hue de Tabarie informs Saladin of the four things which a true knight should observe; one is abstinence or temperance. He then says: "And to tell you the truth, he should, on every Friday, fast, in holy remembrance, that on that day, Jesus Christ, with a lance, for our redemption, was pierced; throughout his life on that day he must fast for our Lord." It is recorded, in old memoirs, of the Mareschal de Boucicaut, that he held Friday in great reverence, would eat nothing on it which had possessed life, and dressed in black to commemorate our Saviour's passion. And hence, on the other hand, the people of his time held it for one of Robert le Diable's worst characteristics, that he neglected that day's fast.†

This powerful association of one day in the week, with the lessons of meekness and forgiveness which we have seen its prototype inculcate, and this one day observed with humble devotion, in honor of man's redemption, must have kept alive a truly Christian spirit, or at least have acted as a check, salutary and powerful, upon the course, otherwise unrestrained, of passion. The feeling which inspired this dedication is not yet extinct. Here, in particular, all public amusements are prohibited on the Friday, as inconsistent with the mystery which it still commemorates. In England, it has lingered in the form of a popular superstition, deeply rooted and widely extended, that no new undertaking should be commenced on that day.

But this perpetuation, throughout the year, of the feelings which the last days of

* Tom. iii, part 2, p. 7.
† De vita Ludovici Grossi: Hist. Franc. p. 132.
‡ Prudent. Hymn vi.

* Cap. 4.
† "Broad Stone of Honor," Tancredus, p. 252.

Holy Week, are intended to inspire, is much better and more effectually to be acknowledged in another institution of past ages. The feudal system, however beautiful in many of its principles, was a constant seed-bed of animosities and wars. Each petty chief arrogated to himself the rights of sovereignty; and all those passions which disturb great monarchs, revenge, ambition, jealousy, and restlessness, were multiplied in innumerable smaller spheres, which occasioned more real suffering to those exposed to their influence, than the commotions of larger governments could have caused. The Church, the only authority which, unarmed, could throw itself between two foes, and act as a mediating power, essayed in every possible way to bring a love of peace home to men's hearts. But they were men ever cased in steel, on whom lessons of general principles had but little power. Unable to cut up the evil by the roots, it turned its care to the rendering it less hurtful, and devised expedients for lessening the horrors, and abridging the calamities of feudal war. For this purpose it seized upon those religious feelings which I have already shown to have resulted from the celebration of Christ's passion during Holy Week; and the success was so marked, that the pious age in which the experiment was made, hesitated not to attribute it to the interposition of heaven.

About the middle of the eleventh century, as a contemporary writer informs us, a covenant, founded upon the love, as well as the fear of God, was established in Aquitaine, and thence gradually spread over all France. It was of this tenor; that, from the vespers of Wednesday until Monday at day-break, no one shall presume to take aught from any man by violence, or to avenge himself of his adversary, or to come down upon a surety for his engagements. Whosoever should infringe this public decree must either compound for his life, or, being excommunicated, be banished the country. In this also did all agree, that this compact should bear the name of the "Truce of God." There could be no doubt regarding the principle of this important regulation, if its original founders had left us in the dark. The time pronounced sacred, and during which war could not be carried on, is precisely that which the Church occupies in Holy Week in the celebration of Christ's passion. That the ground of this consecration was this passion has been clearly recorded; but it is plain that the limits thus assigned were not drawn from the actual time during which our Saviour suffered, seeing that he began his pains on Olivet only in the evening of Thursday, but rather from the ecclesiastical period of celebration, which is from the Wednesday afternoon at Tenebræ till Monday following. Not aware of this, several modern authors have fallen into the mistake of shortening by one day this truce of God, asserting it to have begun on Thursday evening.

See, then, how the Church extended to the whole year the virtuous effects produced for the welfare of men, by the offices of Holy Week; and turned the reverence which they excited to good and durable account in promoting public happiness. What a beneficial influence too! For all men could now reckon, in each week, upon four days' security and peace. They could travel abroad, or attend to their domestic affairs, without danger of molestation, shielded by the religious sanction of this sacred convention. The ravages of war were restrained to three days; there was leisure for passion to cool, and for the mind to sicken at a languishing warfare, and long for home.

Nor must it be thought that this law remained a dead letter. The author to whom I have referred proceeds to say, that many who refused to observe it were soon punished, either by divine judgments, or by the sword of man; "And this," he adds, "most justly; for as Sunday is considered venerable on account of our Lord's resurrection, so ought Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, through reverence of his last supper and passion, to be kept free of all wicked actions." Then he proceeds to detail one or two striking instances, as they were considered, of divine vengeance upon transgressors.* William the Conqueror ac-

* Glabri Rodulphi Historiæ, lib. v, c. 1. Hist. Franc. p. 55.

ceded to this holy truce, approved by a council of his bishops and barons held at Lillebonne, in 1080. Count Raymond published it at Barcelona, and successive Popes, as Urban II, in the celebrated synod of Clermont; Paschal II, in that of Rome; and particularly Innocent II and Alexander III, in the first and second Lateran councils, sanctioned and enforced it.*

This is a strong and incontrovertible example of the happy influence which the celebration of these coming solemnities has exerted upon the general happiness, and the share they have had in humanizing men, and rendering their actions conformable to the feelings and precepts of the gospel. For let me remark to you, that in none of the examples I have brought can it be said, that the vulgar solution of such phenomena will hold good; that a superstitious awe, or fanatical reverence of outward forms, was the active cause. In not one case will it be possible to show that the conduct has been devoid of a feeling which all must pronounce virtuous and holy; or rather that it has not sprung, as a natural result, from the inward sentiment which these sacred observances had inspired. Nay, I have passed over what, perhaps, would have been a proof, stronger than any other, of their influence, because I feared that opinion concerning its value might be divided, or the motives of many among those who gave it might be more easily suspected. I allude to the crusades, those gigantic quests of ancient chivalry, when knighthood, of its own nature a lover of solitary adventure and individual glory, became, so to speak, gregarious, and poured its blood in streams to regain the sepulchre of Christ. Could such a spirit of religious enterprise have anywhere existed, if the thoughts of men had not been taught to solemnize his passion, by the contemplation of scenes which led them yearly in spirit to Jerusalem, and inflamed their minds with warm devotion towards the place of their redemption? Would pilgrims have flocked to Palestine, in spite of Paynim oppression and stripes, and even of death, if Passion-tide, in their own country, had ever passed over, like any other week, without offices, without mourning, without deep expressions of sympathy for the sufferings of Christ? Was it not the thought how much more feeling will all these functions be, upon the very spot whereon what they commemorate occurred, that necessarily formed the first link in the reasoning which led them from their homes? Could they have been induced to undertake so long, so wearisome, and so perilous a journey, with no other prospect, during the season commemorative of the passion, than a solitary every day service on one morning of the week? And we know that to secure these pious palmers from the vexatious tyranny of the infidels, was one of the great motives of these expeditions.

But on this subject I do not wish to dwell. Without entering on such contested ground, I flatter myself that enough has been said to show what an important influence upon public virtue the solemn yearly celebration of Christ's passion, through its affecting ceremonial has exerted. It has brought men, even unwillingly, to the observance of propriety; it has taught kings humility and charity; it has softened the harshness of feudal enmities, and produced meekness in forgiving wrongs. But we have also seen this week become, in some sort, the very heart of the entire year (as its mystery is of Christianity), sending forth a living stream of holy and solemn feeling, which circulated through the whole twelve months, beating powerfully at short intervals through its frame, and renewing at each stroke the healthy and quickening action of its first impulse.

The effects thus produced upon society must have depended, in a great measure, upon the operation which this solemnization had in each individual; and we cannot doubt that these were, as they now are, excellently beneficial. For if the death of Christ be the sinner's only refuge, and the just man's only hope, according as the Catholic Church hath ever taught, it cannot be without good and wholesome effects, to turn the mind of each, for a certain space, entirely towards this subject, excluding, as

* Nat. Alex. tom. vi, p. 783.

much as possible, at the same time, all other distracting thoughts. To understand, however, the power of this most wise disposition, it is fair to consider this season with all its attendant circumstances.

And first, we should not forget that Holy Week appears not suddenly in the midst of the year, to be entered upon abruptly and without preparation. It has a solemn vestibule in the previous humiliation of Lent, which, by fasting and retirement from the usual dissipations of the remaining year, brings the mind to a proper tone for feeling what is to come. This is like a solitude round a temple, such as girded the Egyptian Oasis; and prevents the intrusion of thoughts and impressions too fresh from the world and its vanities. As the more important moment of initiation approaches, the gloom becomes more dense, and during Passion Week, in which now we are, we feel ourselves surrounded by sad preparations, inasmuch as every part of our liturgy speaks of Christ's passion, and the outward signs of mourning have already appeared in our churches. During this Lenten season there are daily sermons in the principal churches, wherein eloquent men unfold all the truths of religion with unction and zeal. In the week just passed, you may have noticed how, during certain hours of the afternoons, every place of ordinary refreshment was empty and closed. But instead of them the churches were all open and full; for, during those days, other learned priests, in familiar discourse, expounded to the people the duty of returning to God by repentance, through the sacrament of penance. They taught them in the strongest terms the necessity of changing their lives, and effectually turning from sin; and then dwelt on the purity of heart and burning love with which, at Easter, they should comply with the Church's precept of receiving the sacred communion. These were the themes prescribed to them during the week just elapsed. The work of preparation has not ended here. For almost every order of men there have been opened courses of spiritual exercises or retreats, that is, perfect retirement from all other occupation to prayer and pious reflection. The noblemen have held their's in the chapel at the Gesù; ladies at the oratory of the Caravita; and the numerous houses set aside for this purpose have been crowded; and not a few, whom infirmity prevents from joining them, have observed these pious practices at home. This evening, the university, and every establishment of education, commences a similar course of retirements and devotions, which will close on Wednesday morning. During these days, the time is divided between hearing the word of God, chiefly in regard to its most saving truths, and meditating thereon in solitude.

It is thus prepared that the Catholic approaches, or is desired to approach, the closing days of the next week, and to assist at those beautiful services which lead us through the history of our dear Redeemer's passion. The conscience has been purged from sin, and the pledge of salvation probably received, the ordinary distractions of life have been gradually excluded, and the temper of the soul brought into harmony with the feeling they inspire. They are not intended, therefore, to produce a sudden and magical effect, but only to come upon the soul with a natural sympathetic power, resulting as much from the disposition of our minds as from their own intrinsic worth.

This view of the last days, or rather of the entire of Holy Week, as a time of individual sanctification, is by no means peculiar to Rome, or to this age. It is inculcated in every Catholic country. In Paris there are always such public exercises preparatory to it; and in Spain, as well as every part of Italy, the same course is pursued. In former times it was so in our own country. In the book of ecclesiastical laws, written originally by Theodulph, bishop of Orleans, in the eighth century, and adopted in England, in 994, we find it enacted, that all the faithful partake of the holy communion every Sunday in Lent, and on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Holy Week, and Easter Sunday; and likewise, that all the days of Easter Week be kept with equal devotion.*

* Wilkins, Conc. Ang. tom i, p. 280.

That the observance of this time, in such a manner, must be to many most blessed, no one will, I think, deny. For opportunities are thus certainly given, on occasion of it, to ponder well upon the great duties of the Christian state, and the means of accomplishing them; and all this, most surely, would not have been devised nor executed but for the veneration with which the celebration of our Saviour's death is regarded, and the holiness and purity with which it seems to us, that so sacred a commemoration and so awful a representation should be attended.

And if these can indirectly perform so much, through the preparation they require, what shall we say of themselves? Combining, in justest proportions, all that can reach the soul,—beauty, solemnity, dignity, and pathos, performed under circumstances calculated to soothe the feelings of the sternest mind, and dedicated to the most Christian of all possible objects, must they not have a devotional influence on all that court it with a pious disposition? Go to the Sixtine chapel, with the impression that you are not about to witness a ceremony, but to assist at an annual remembrance of His death, whom you should love,—a remembrance, too, wherein you have a part, as you had in the reality—in which your compassion, not your curiosity, your heart and not your captiousness, ought to be engaged; unlock all the nerves of the soul, that emotion may enter in through every sense; follow the words which are recited, join in the prayers that are poured forth, listen to the pathetic strains in which the Church utters her wail, drinking in their feeling rather than admiring their art,—and I will promise you, that, when the evening shade has closed over the last cadences of the plaintive music, you will arise and go home, as you would from the house of mourning, "a sadder but a better man."

And is not this truly the house of mourning into which you will enter? Is it not to the perpetual anniversary of One most dear to us that we are summoned? When our nearest of kin depart, we put on mourning weeds, and we sorrow for a time. And when the year comes round, so long as the dark suit upon our bodies reminds us, we recal the day. The Church, unfailing in her ordinances as in her existence, willeth not that we so quickly forget. She sets no limits to the religious remembrance of the departed, in our supplications to God; she perpetuates their memory, if they live among the saints, to the end of time. How, then, can she ever forget that awful stroke which robbed earth of its glory, and brought all nature into sorrow? Surely, to allow its anniversary to pass over, without a celebration worthy of the event, would be an unnatural indifference in her, not even to be suspected.

Who knoweth not, how closely allied are the tender emotions of piety unto sorrow? Who hath not felt, how moments of distress are moments of fervor for the soul that seeketh God? I believe, that hardly a religion, true or false, will be found, without a festival of sorrow, wherein men bewail the past loss of some worshipped or honored being. The ancient mysteries of Egypt had certainly such; and the maidens of Judah annually retired into the hills to mourn over the virginity of Jephtha's daughter. The Persians annually celebrate their Aaschoor, or mourning feast, for Hussein's death. The squares are covered with black, and stages are erected on which the Mullahs relate the sorrowful story, while the audience are in tears. For ten days, processions, alms-deeds, and scenes of extravagant sorrow, occupy the city, and ceremonies are performed which graphically and dramatically represent the fate of the young Caliph.* These are all various expressions of the same want, felt in every religion, of dedicating the tenderer emotions to the service of God, as those which best can harmonize with affectionate devotion. And shall the Christian worship alone, which presents a just, a moving, a sublime occasion of sorrow, in the death of an incarnate God for our sin, dry up, by stern decree, the fountain of such pure emotion, or afford no room for outwardly exercising such true and holy feelings?

Nay, rather, was she not bound to scoop out a channel through which they might

* Thevenot, vol. ii, p. 383.

flow undisturbed by the troubled waters of worldly solicitude? Could we have expected from her less, than that she should have digged a cistern, deep and wide, for such pure sentiments, and thence sluiced it off, as we have seen her do, over the barrenness of the remaining seasons, to refresh them with a living stream?

It is difficult to say from what principle of self-knowledge the notion sprung in modern religions, that outward forms destroy or disturb the inward spirit. It should seem, that the very knowledge of man's two-fold constitution would expose the idea to scorn. It must be that daily experience proves, how soon and how easily men forget their inward duty, unless outwardly reminded, through the senses, of its obligation. Wherefore it should have been decided in later times, that the ear alone is the channel of admonition and encouragement, and that the eye,—that noblest and quickest of senses, which seizes by impulse what the other receives by succession,—is not worthily to be employed for religion, I own the reason is hidden from me. One hand fashioned both; and why should not both be rendered back in homage to Him? If the splendor of religious ceremony may bewitch, and fix the eye upon the instrument instead of the object, as surely may the orator's skill, or the ornaments of his speech.

CATHOLIC MELODIES.

NO. III.

EASTER ANTHEM.*

1st voice.—Morning breaks in splendor round,—
Sounds of gladness fill the air!
2d voice.—But the soul in sadness bound,
Yields no echo to its cheer.
1st voice.—Wildly from the sepulchre,
Breaks a cry of agony!
2d voice.—Hark! 'tis Mary's voice we hear,—
"They have ta'en our Lord away."
Both. Hark, &c.

1st voice.—Hast'ning with the speed of light,
To the sepulchre they run.
2d voice.—Bands of angels meet their sight,
Telling that the work is done;
1st voice.—"Seek no more among the dead,—
Christ is risen,—man is free;—
2d voice.—Death! thy sting 's forever fled!
Grave! where is thy victory?"
Both. Death, &c.

1st voice.—Lo! the promise is fulfilled,
Christ, our passover was slain,
2d voice.—Witness earth! his blood was spilled,—
Witness, heaven! he rose again!
1st voice.—Christ is risen,—wake the strain!
Wide o'er earth the tidings sound!
2d voice.—Christ is risen,—once again,
Shout Jehovah's praise around!
Both. Christ, &c.

St. Louis, Mo. MOÏNA.

* The words of this anthem have been set to music by Mr. B. Cross of Philadelphia.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

ROME.—Mons. Cadolini, archbishop of Edessa, and secretary of the Propaganda, was promoted to the dignity of Cardinal, and transferred to the archbishopric of Ferrara, on the 29th of January. His successor, as secretary of the Propaganda, is Mons. Brunelli.

Three other cardinals, Villadicani, archbishop of Messina,—Mangelli, and Serafini, were created on the same occasion.

The Pope has given orders to have St. Paul's Church finished for the next jubilee, in 1850. Hopes are entertained that he may live to consecrate it, since he is in excellent health, although he is now in his seventy-eighth year.

Catholic Herald.

ENGLAND.—*Catholicity, Puseyism, &c.*—We copy from the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, a Methodist paper of N. York, the following letter which may therefore be considered impartial.

LIVERPOOL, *Jan.* 27, 1843.

My dear Brother Coles: The rapid increase of Popery in this country is a subject of great and growing interest to all classes of community; and not only to this nation, but to the world.

According to the Catholic Directory for 1843, that body of people have five hundred chapels in England and Wales; in Scotland seventy-one; besides twenty-seven stations where divine service is performed, making a total of five hundred and seventy-one. In 1840 they had, according to their Directory, five hundred and twenty-two; so that the increase in two years was forty-nine; whereas the increase for fifteen years previously, that is, from 1824 to 1839, was only ninety-six; so that Roman places of worship in England, Scotland and Wales, increased something more than one-half as much in 1841 and 1842, as they did in fifteen years previously to 1839. Taking the three last past years together, viz., 1840, 1841, and 1842, their increase of places of worship will have been in those years, one hundred and eighteen, or twenty-two more during those years than in fifteen years previously. In 1840, according to their Directory of that year, there were six hundred and fifteen Popish priests in England, Scotland, and Wales. This year, according to the new Directory, they have seven hundred and thirty-three, being an increase of one hundred and eighteen in the last two years. In England they have eight colleges, and one in Scotland; eight convents for nuns and sisters of charity, and three monasteries. In 1840 they had sixty seminaries of education. The Directory for this year does not mention the number.

These are fearful and rapid strides of the Man of Sin in this professedly Protestant nation. Now if their places of worship should increase in the same ratio for ten years to come, as they have done for three years last past, their increase would be three hundred and ninety-three, making a grand total of nine hundred and sixty-four. And if the increase of priests should be in the same proportion for ten years to come, with the two last past years, the increase would be five hundred and ninety, making a total number of one thousand three hundred and twenty-three. And it must be borne in mind, that this rapid increase does not grow here, as in the United States, by emigration, *but out of British born subjects.*

That this success and other signs of the times should greatly encourage the Roman Catholics can be no wonder; and that the same reasons should appal many a fearful Protestant heart can be no surprise. But the most astounding thing in the ecclesiastical hemisphere of this country is the amazing spread of Puseyism. It is supposed by many that there are twenty thousand Episcopal clergymen in the kingdom, and that fifteen thousand out of the number are more or less tainted with the semi-Popery of Dr. Pusey's doctrines.

Another singular fact, not entirely unconnected with this subject, is, that there is very little more intercourse between the high and the low Church party in the land, than there was between the Jews and the Samaritans of old. And the high Church party are trying constantly to draw the lines of separation still wider, by withdrawing themselves from every institution under Church patronage, which they cannot bring under their own exclusive influence. The whole body is firmly united together in their plans of operation; and they have wealth, talents, and influence on their side. They have men among them of great leisure, deeply skilled in the lore of ancient learning; and they are throwing this, like dust, into the eyes of the public by handfuls, and blinding them by thousands, to the pure doctrines of Christianity, as taught by the reformers and their followers; while great numbers

of young men from the universities, seeing, or thinking they see, a nearer road to preferment—to fine broad cloth, and fat livings—by the way of Puseyism, are constantly joining their ranks, to the great grief of thousands.

Now, sir, look at the other side of this picture. Perhaps the English Church was never better supplied with pious, learned, talented, laborious, evangelical ministers, than she is at present; but they are so greatly outnumbered by the other party as to make them timid in action. Then, again, the evangelical party have no regular, well-digested, ostensible plan of action. They do not work in concert. They have no common bond of union. Each one labors in his little, local, and individual sphere, and is telling his congregation, from time to time, of the rapid spread of Puseyism and Popery; and this, too, in such a manner as is much more calculated to discourage than to rouse the laity to any well-organized plan of opposition. Further, the low churchmen have no well-selected, bold, determined leader. No hardy, fearless, lion-hearted person, such as Wickliffe or Luther, steps forward, to place himself at the head of that body to lead them onward in combined action against Puseyism and Popery—to grapple for the great and blessed boon of the reformation, which is in danger of being lost to the nation. While, on the other side, Dr. Pusey, as a bold, daring, learned leader of his sect, rushes forward reckless of consequences; and, as if the means were to justify the end, he is not scrupulous to a shade either as to what he says or does. Witness his vile attack on the Wesleyan Methodists, after he has been answered, and his allegations refuted, time and again.

In addition to the above gloom which hangs over the evangelical party, they are poor, as a body, compared to their opponents; and not only so, but they are afraid to act in union, lest they should trespass on the prerogatives of their diocesans. Not so with their enemies.

There is another topic closely allied to this which is a curse to the Church and the nation; I mean the old, hackneyed, unproved and unprovable subject of apostolic succession, which serves to keep the low Church party, as well as the other, at a cold measured distance from both the Wesleyans and the Dissenters; yet, in my humble opinion, the evangelical party never will be able to contend successfully with Puseyism and Popery without the aid of the above mentioned sects. What is a little remarkable, or at least worthy of passing notice at this time, is the venom with which Pusey and his followers are assailing the Wesleyans and the Dissenters; but especially the former. No doubt this is Puseyite policy; for should the "tug of war" ever fairly commence in Britain as to whether Popery or Protestantism should reign, both Dr. Pusey and the Papists know their greatest difficulties would arise from this quarter; and hence their hostility to the Methodist system is equally as great as their hatred to the Methodist doctrines, or to the Methodists as a body. That the evangelical party should be blind to these things, and act in that blindness, may prove as fatal to them as if they were put to sleep by magnetism, or some other *ism*, until Dr. Pusey and his followers get the noose they are preparing for them fairly around their necks; and then, with one death-like pull, they may drag them under Popish rule and Popish reign.

You are probably aware, sir, that tapers and the candelabra are already introduced, and not a few churches burn lights at the altar, in the day time. Among the places which do this, Leeds, Liverpool, Mary-le-bone, and Ipswich, may be mentioned. What the end will be heaven only knows.

I remain, my dear brother, yours very truly.

JOHN TRIPPETT.

Discussion.—A public discussion took place lately at Manchester, between Mr. Cleary, a Catholic, and Mr. Atkinson, a member of the Protestant association. The propositions advanced by the former were, that the Church of Christ is infallible, that the universal Church in communion with the see of Rome is the only true Church, and that the reformed sects are heretical and schismatical. The debate was listened to by two thousand persons. When the discussion ended, Mr. Love, of the mercantile firm of Love and Barton, in Manchester, made a public declaration that he renounced Protestantism, and embraced the Catholic faith. His example was followed by ten other persons.

Lady Young, the friend of Queen Victoria, and possessing an income of more than sixty thousand dollars, was lately admitted into the Catholic Church.—*Mélanges Religieux.*

Rev. Mr. Newman.—We learn from a private, but highly creditable source, that this distinguished Oxford divine will spend next Passion week at St. Mary's college, Oscott. May the rumor be true!

The Bishop of London on the "Surplice Question."—The bishop of London, while adverting in his recently published charge to the question, whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear a surplice or a gown, recommends it as "most consonant with the intention of the Church, that he should wear a surplice when

preaching after the morning service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening." His lordship's sentiments on this, as on some other points, would appear to have undergone considerable alteration, the greatest, indeed, of which the nature of things will admit, being no less than an alteration from black to white. In the year 1825, while bishop of Chester, his language to the clergy of the diocess was—"Gentlemen, it is most consonant with the intention of the Church, that you should, while preaching, array yourselves in *black*." In the year 1843 his language to the clergy of the diocess of London is—"Gentlemen, it is most consonant with the intention of the Church, that you should, while preaching, array yourselves in *white*." It would certainly be satisfactory to the public—the clerical portion of it more especially—if his lordship would be condescending enough to explain how he came by this new light. If it be difficult to decide when "doctors disagree" with each other, it must be even more difficult to do so when they disagree with themselves.—*Cheshire paper.*

Ireland.—There cannot be a greater proof of the paternal interest taken by the sovereign pontiff, Gregory XVI, in the Catholic Church of Ireland, and of the high estimation in which it is held by his holiness, than his anxious desire to establish Irish ecclesiastics as bishops in the different sees connected with its foreign missions, and his practice of conferring suitable dignities on others of them, so soon as he is informed of their deserts and claims on his beneficence. An instance has lately occurred in the person of the Rev. Mr. Laffan, one of the senior priests in the church of the Conception, Marlborough street, Dublin. His holiness, having been informed by a respectable dignitary of the Church of this reverend gentleman's many years of valuable services in the ministry, of his successful teaching in the cause of religion, and of his zeal for the maintenance of the dignity and respectability of public worship, has been graciously pleased, within these few days, to transmit to him, from himself personally, the degree of doctor of divinity.

We have to announce the gratifying intelligence that two of the household of a highly respectable Protestant family, in the neighborhood of this city, at the county Kilkenny side of the river, were received into the Catholic Church during the present week.—*Waterford Chronicle.*

Restitution to the Catholics of one of the Cathedrals of Dublin.—A correspondent says that many persons in the above city are of opinion that the Protestants ought to convene a meeting of their body, and enter into a magnanimous resolution to make restitution of at least one of the ancient Cathedrals (St. Paul's or Christ church) to the Catholics, whose fathers built, endowed, and possessed them! This resolve would be the more opportune, when it is found that in the vicinity of those churches, in a circumference of less than half a mile, there are at least *nine* churches (without including the church of St. Catherine) for the accommodation of Protestants, whereas one of these churches would more than suffice for all the Protestants in the metropolis.—*True Tablet.*

Joy bells for St. Paul's Catholic Church in Dublin.—In a short time it is expected that the splendid peal of joy bells for the new church of St. Paul, Arra quay, Dublin, will be ready. They will be the first of the kind connected with a Catholic church in Dublin since the "glorious, pious, and immortal" plunderers of all that is holy and sacred deprived us of our churches, bells and beadles.—*Ibid.*

Spain.—The Catholic clergy of Spain continue giving constant proofs of their faith amidst all the sufferings and penury endured by them under existing circumstances As if all that were not sufficient, they are made the victims of calumny by foreigners, who seek to deprive them of the brilliant crown of glory which they have merited, and which they still merit, on account of their constancy in professing the faith, and their firmness in fulfilling their duties. It is stated in a London periodical, that half of the clergy of Seville are Deists. This is a falsehood. In a work published, also in England, by a Mr. Borrow (a Bible distributor who was sent here to poison us with Protestantism, just as the Chinese have been poisoned by the English with opium) it is falsely asserted, that, amongst the Spanish clergy there are many of Jewish origin who still profess Judaism.—*Catolico of Madrid.*

Canonization.—In France the preparatory investigations and proceedings have been instituted for the canonization of the Rev. Mr. De la Salle, founder of the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, a society that labors quietly, but with the most astonishing success, in instilling into the minds of youth, particularly those of the poorer class, the principles of religion, and such knowledge as will fit them for usefulness in the world. The most extensive and minute inquiries have been made relative to the life of Mr. De la Salle, and the numerous testimonies that have been procured, either from the cotemporaries of those who were witnesses of his virtues, or from others who have had an opportunity of forming a correct opinion upon the subject, bear evidence to the fact, that the holy priest prac-

tised in an heroic degree, the Christian and sacerdotal virtues. It is to be hoped that a decision to this effect will emanate from the holy see.

Mr. De la Salle was born at Rheims on the 30th of April, 1651, studied at St. Sulpice, in Paris, and afterwards became a canon of the cathedral at Rheims, and received the doctor's cap in the university of the same city. From the year 1681, he lived among his brethren. His death occurred at Rouen, in 1701.—*Propagateur Catholique.*

THE VIRGINS OF TYROL.—The *Presbyterian* has republished a foul libel on one of these remarkable personages, borrowed from the *Liverpool Standard*, and observes that it will be read with confusion to the Roman Catholics. We think that the shame should be felt by the propagators of the atrocious calumny, of which an authentic refutation is given in the *London Catholic Magazine* of January. We refer our readers for the refutation of this atrocious calumny to the letter of the prince bishop of Trent, published in our number of the 9th of March.

Cath. Herald.

BELGIUM.—Mr. Frederick Valland, of the canton of Berne, Switzerland, recently made the solemn abjuration of Protestantism, in the chapel of the Jesuits, at Brussels. Mons. Fornari, nuncio of his holiness, administered confirmation to him. The convert also received holy communion.—*Ibid.*

CEYLON.—Rev. C. Russell, professor in Maynooth college, Ireland, recently appointed vicar apostolic of the island of Ceylon, is at Rome, seeking to be released from accepting the new dignity.—*Catholic Herald.*

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CHINA.—The *Univers* of the 12th February, contains the following remarkable statement. We deem it our duty to inform our readers that we have ourselves for some days been prepared, through our own letters from Rome, for the announcement:

"During the last fortnight, accounts the most delightful to the Christian world, have been prevalent in Paris. From letters written by persons of the highest character, which we have had under our own inspection, we learn that authentic accounts have been received in the capital of Christianity from the Catholic missionaries in China, announcing that the Chinese emperor will, for the future, permit missionaries free entrance, and right of travelling without obstacle, through his dominions; not content with this concession, the emperor himself has solicited that new and more numerous missionaries should be sent out. It is certain that the Propaganda has already appointed forty religious, amongst whom are many Jesuits, whose names are announced to the mission. The departure of these missionaries for China will be immediate.

"These accounts from China attest facts of another description, and which, to Christians, will explain those we have above announced. The silence we have preserved during the last fortnight, will be a guarantee to our readers that if we speak out to-day, it is on testimony the most weighty and worthy of belief. A letter which we received yesterday from Rome contains the following:—*Authentic letters from the Chinese missionaries confirm the astounding miracle of the apparition of our Lord, in the presence of a vast number of the faithful and unbelievers.*"

The *Univers* states it has received other details, but contents itself with quoting some observations from the *Gazette du Simplon* of the 8th of February. Our letters confirm its details:

"Intelligence of undoubted authority has arrived from the apostolic vicariate of China, stating that a great multitude of Christians and Pagans belonging to that nation, saw in the air, the heaven being serene and clear, the image of Christ Jesus crucified."—*Cork Examiner.*

CANADA.—*New Bishopric.*—From the *Canadien* and *Mélanges Religiéux*, we learn that the holy see has formed a new diocess in the British possessions, to consist of the province of New Brunswick, which hitherto was subject to the bishop of Charlottetown. The Very Rev. William Dullard, hitherto vicar general of the bishop of Charlottetown, and pastor of the congregation of Fredericktown is the bishop elect.—*Herald.*

Education.—The brothers of the Christian schools will soon commence an establishment in Quebec. Their labors in Montreal are blessed with the happiest results to religion and morality.

SOUTH AMERICA.—From a private letter, dated January 13th, from Rio de Janeiro we learn some interesting particulars concerning the missions of South America. In 1816, thirty-six Capuchin friars established themselves at Bahia in Brazil, whence most of them sallied forth into the interior of the country to labor at the conversion of the savages. From that time until a few months since, no intelligence had been received from two of these missionaries. One of them, Father Louis de Livorno has lately returned to the convent where his brethren reside, to the agreeable surprise of all; but he is so emaciated and worn out as to exhibit rather the appearance of a spectre from the other world. The news of this extraordinary being having reached Rio de Janeiro despatches were immediately sent to Bahia to obtain a portrait and a

biographical sketch of the holy man. The picture represents him surrounded by a band of savages, of the Cannibal tribe, which, with the divine blessing, he had succeeded in converting to the faith. It appears that when he first visited this barbarous people, he was accompanied by three Indians, who soon left him alone in the midst of a wild and trackless region. Retiring to a neighboring hill, he fixed his dwelling there, and six long months rolled over his head before the sound of any human voice interrupted the silence of his dreary solitude. While he was thus passing his time in prayer and patient endurance, the quiet of the forest was suddenly broken by the approach of more than five hundred savages, who presented themselves before the missionary and expressed their willingness to learn from him the truths of religion. Ever since that period he has been employed in the instruction of the Indians, whom he has induced to renounce polygamy, with their superstitions, to observe the precepts of Christianity, and to exchange their wandering life for the pursuit of agriculture. Speaking of the Jesuits, the same correspondent says: "The Father Provincial, Mariano Berdugo, was invited, with twenty-two of his brethren, to establish a college in the city of Buenos Ayres. The request was made by President Rosas, who is the supreme ruler of the Argentine republic. This man, after having profanely succeeded, by means of fear, in introducing his likeness into some of the churches, had good reason to suppose that the inmates of the college which he had just founded, would willingly receive his painting into their chapel; but he was mistaken. He discovered that he had to deal with the real sons of St. Ignatius. Father Berdugo replied, in respectful terms, to the president, that he would place his portrait in a most conspicuous part of the college, but could not station it in the house of divine worship. The courtezans of Rosas appeared to be satisfied with the answer of Father Berdugo, but he soon began to perceive the consequences of having displeased the tyrant. After some time he was informed by an unknown person, that the following day was appointed for the visitation of the college by the civil authorities; upon which the fathers of the institution immediately held a council, and sent home to their respective families the pupils that had been placed under their charge, one hundred and twenty in number. The superior and three of his brethren succeeded in getting on board of a vessel, disguised as English sailors. Father Berdugo, with one of his companions, came to this city (Rio de Janeiro) for refuge, and were received with every mark of respect by the nuncio, the bishop, and the authorities. The government at Buenos Ayres having issued orders that no passports should be furnished to the Jesuits who had remained there, the people were indignant at the measure, and the fathers were invited to resume their occupations, nothing more being said about the portrait of *Salvador Rosas*. The ostensible object of the government was to lay hold of the four individuals, who had succeeded in leaving the visiters with empty hands. I am informed that the indefatigable members of your order (the Jesuits) have established themselves at Cordova, in the province of Tacuman (Bolivia). They are eight in number, among whom is the celebrated Padre de la Pegna, of Mexico. What will you say if I tell you that we are daily looking for news from the city of Conception, the capital of Paraguay. Two fathers of your society have availed themselves of the demise of the despot, Dr. Francia, to visit that celebrated spot. We are daily expecting to be informed, that time is working wonders."

DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALT.—*Circular*—The next Provincial Council will be opened on the fourth Sunday after Easter. I earnestly recommend to the reverend clergy and the faithful of my diocess the important business which will engage the attention of the assembled prelates. For which purpose, I request the reverend clergy, from the 29th of April to the 21st of May—1. To add daily at mass the Collect of the Holy Ghost. 2. To say weekly one mass of the Holy Ghost. 3. To solicit the faithful under their spiritual charge to offer up their prayers, and, once at least, to receive Holy Communion with the intention of invoking the light and grace of heaven on our proceedings.

Religious communities are requested to offer up for the same object, such special acts of devotion as may be approved of by their spiritual directors.

†SAMUEL, *Archbishop of Baltimore.*

Given at Baltimore, on Thursday, in the 4th week in Lent, 1843.

Spiritual Retreat at St. Vincent de Paul's.—The retreat for the laity commenced in this church on Sunday, the 12th of March, under the direction of the zealous F. McElroy, of Frederick city. Father McElroy is a distinguished member of the Society of Jesus, and the well-earned reputation of his order for piety and learning, was fully sustained by the eminent ecclesiastic who presided at these religious exercises.

In the morning of that day the Rev. Mr.

Schreiber opened the retreat by a preparatory discourse, pointing out to the faithful the great advantages to be derived from these pious exercises, if entered upon with becoming dispositions—this species of devotion was not novel in the Church—even the faithful Israelite of the old law was exact in its observance; and, under the Jewish dispensation, the favorites of the Most High sought the sequestered dell or the lofty mountain top, to commune with heaven; the example of the Saviour was introduced, and his disciples awaiting the descent of the holy spirit. In every age the Christian Church points to her holy hermits, her fervent anchorites, her pious recluse, who withdrew from the busy haunts of men, to spend their lives in holy seclusion, far from a world that placed so many snares for the feet of the unwary. The subject was continued in the afternoon of the same day, by the Rev. J. B. Gildea, in an energetic appeal to the people of his charge, to avail themselves of the opportunity now offered them—the holy to become more holy, and the wanderer from virtue to return to the service of heaven.

As the character of the speaker, even the very appearance of the individual, is not without its influence on such occasions, Father McElroy was habited in the dress of his order; and the mild and pensive composure of his countenance indicated one who was solely taken up with the things of heaven—with a heart overflowing with mildest charity, he pictured the goodness of God, ever ready to receive the repentant to favor—in fervid and glowing outline he portrayed the reward of bliss eternal, awaiting such as repent and persevere to the end; and in solemn warning denounced the obduracy of the sinner, deaf to the voice of grace, and unmoved by the stings of conscience.

Decorated with but few of the flowers of the rhetorician, the eloquence of Father McElroy is peculiar in its forcible appeals to the intellect; holding the mind of his auditory as if at will, he alluded to the instances wherein the tired mercies of heaven seemed unwilling to bear longer with the oft repeated crimes of the obstinate sinner: whilst, as an ambassador for Christ, and one vested with authority, in the name of his God, he promised favor and forgiveness to such as sincerely repent.

The all important object of the retreat was self-knowledge—the sinner was to learn how he stood in the presence of his Creator, and the sublime end of his creation was strikingly pictured to his mind, whilst the faculties of the soul were enlisted in the investigation. *The will* was first calmly invited to seek its end, and soon taught to believe that none could be holier than submission to the adorable will of Him who formed it. *Memory* was the next faculty, introduced as the abundant store-house where Virtue deposited her treasures, and finally *Intelligence* drew from both an offering worthy the divine Creator. Thus spending the first day in showing how reasonable was the service of man to his God, and how fitting the application of his ennobling faculties when exerted to the honor of Him who gave them.

But man needed blessings—he needed the divine favor and protection—he must therefore ask them ere he could hope to receive, and at once the excellence and advantage of *prayer* invited his attention; nor was this prayer so much the sounding accents of the lips, as the deep and fervent breathings of the spirit—it was the unspoken prayer to which he alluded—the silent entreaty of the heart, which in holy meditation led the soul into solitude, there to commune with God. It was in this salutary exercise of meditation, on the things of eternity, that the faculties of the soul, will, memory, and understanding, were in a special manner introduced as most efficacious in moving the mercy of heaven.

The goodness of God was next portrayed, and this new favor inviting them to a spiritual retreat, was designated as another signal proof that the Almighty wished not the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live; he knew they would avail themselves of the proffered blessing—they would accept the boon held out to them—the mild mercies of the Saviour were recounted, as so many motives to repentance—the sweet reception of the prodigal into favor, and the prayer of pardon on Calvary were feelingly introduced—the joys of heaven, promised as a reward for virtue, and the dread tortures of hell pointed at, as the punishment of vice—and if the countenance of the sinner was mantled with shame at his past ingratitude, his hopes now brightened, as looking through the tear of his penitent love, he sighed for pardon. It were unnecessary to go through the various exercises of this retreat, which lasted eight days; suffice it to say, that it was crowned with the happiest results. We are informed that between two and three thousand persons received holy communion in St. Vincent's alone, whilst many others, of different congregations, who attended these spiritual exercises, partook of the life-giving sacrament in their respective churches. S.

Conversions.—Among those who have been of late admitted into the Catholic Church in Baltimore, are two officers of the United States' Army.

Indian Missions.—On Sunday, the 12th of March, a collection was taken in the different Catholic churches of Baltimore, for the benefit of the missions among the Indians of the Rocky Mountains. The collection, with the private donations obtained by Father De Smet, amounted to nearly eight hundred dollars.

Washington's Birth-day.—The twenty-second of February was celebrated with appropriate ceremonies at St. Mary's College, Baltimore, and at Georgetown College, D. C. Addresses were delivered in both institutions, and were a bright evidence of the vigorous growth of true patriotism among the students assembled within their walls. At Georgetown, the Declaration of Independence was read by William D. Wynn, of Georgia, after some felicitous remarks, and an oration delivered before the Philodemic Society, by George C. Morgan, of Maryland. We have been politely favored with a copy of the oration, a rapid glance at which has convinced us that it is an ardent and beautiful tribute to the memory of our illustrious Washington. After the oration the large audience, consisting of the élite lately assembled in the District of Columbia, proceeded to the spacious dining hall of the students, where a sumptuous and plentiful repast, had been prepared by the Faculty and Philodemic Society. During the entertainment, the president of the college having paid a high and merited compliment to the Hon. C. G. Ferris, of New York, this gentleman arose and alluded in terms of the highest encomium to the oration of Mr. Morgan. He concluded by expressing a wish "that his country might ever continue to look with a favorable and fostering eye upon institutions which, like the university of Georgetown, were the nurseries of virtue and learning—schools in which the young American was qualified, in every respect, to fill the high and responsible places of himself and colleagues, when they should have passed from the scene of action to the silence of the tomb."

Diocess of Charleston.—We have learned from good authority that no appointment will be made to the vacant see of Charleston, before the convention of the fifth provincial council in May.

Diocess of Natchez.—The exercises for a spiritual retreat of four days will begin at the Catholic Church, on this evening, at early candle light, when the introductory sermon explaining its object, regulations, &c., will be delivered by the Rev. John Timon, C. M.—*Vicksburg Sentinel, March 7.*

Diocess of Boston.—The bill introduced into the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the indemnification of the sufferers by the burning of the Charlestown convent, has been rejected by that body.

Diocess of New Orleans.—*Decision of the Superior Court, in Louisiana.*—As it has been currently reported through the papers in this section of the country, on the strength of erroneous statements in a New Orleans print, that a decision had emanated from the supreme tribunal of that state, declaring that *neither the Pope nor any bishop has the power of appointing a priest to a parish against the consent of the people*, we deem it a duty to contradict this false assertion, and to inform our readers that the decision by the supreme court in Louisiana, does not contain one word relative to the papal or episcopal power in the appointment of clergymen. In fact, it could scarcely be conceived that a body of intelligent men, such as judges ought to be, would commit themselves so far as to undertake the decision of a question, that is no more within their competency than the consecration of a bishop belongs to the president of the United States. When a church is incorporated, the trustees are evidently the legal administrators of its temporalities, and they discharge their duty so long as they act in conformity to the conditions of the trust confided to them. But the right to exercise the sacred ministry in any particular place is conferred by ecclesiastical power only, and no acts of jurisdiction on the part of any Catholic clergymen would be valid, without this sanction, all the decisions of the civil courts in the land notwithstanding.

Retreat.—A retreat for the clergy of the diocess was opened at New Orleans on the 7th of March, and terminated on the 14th.

Puseyism.—The following extract from the correspondence of an Episcopalian paper, is a consoling evidence that, however boldly some writers may protest against the influence of the Oxford movement, in exhibiting the truth of Catholicity, its religious investigations are attended, even in this country, with a near approximation to the ancient Church, and sometimes with an open avowal of her truth and divine origin.

"*Messrs. Editors:* What can be the meaning of this great outcry against Puseyism? Are not the intelligent portion of the religious world aware of the fact, that many things which they denounce as Puseyism, are chargeable on the Episcopal Church itself?

"First, then, the apostolical succession. It is the doctrine of the Episcopal Church, that no religious society is a Church of Christ, that has not in it a ministry derived from the apostles in regular succession. The question then is, does

such succession constitute a Christian Church? If not, where is the evidence that the Episcopal is such a Church? But if it does, the Roman Catholic Church, having in it that succession, is a Church of the kind; in which event it would follow, that, as the majority of a body is the body itself, that Church being the majority, it is *the* Church, and Episcopalians are schismatics in their separation from her, and ought therefore to return to the bosom of their mother, as the Puseyites are inclined to do, and as all consistent Episcopalians *must* do."—*N. York Evangelist.*

In quoting this article, the *New York Churchman* remarks:

"There is a straightforwardness in the article from the N. York Evangelist, which we should be happy to find on all subjects discussed in the same quarter. The argument in the second paragraph is grounded on the Roman fallacy that the truth, which is the essence of the Church, and is presupposed to its existence, is dependent on its authority; an error of the same nature with the common Protestant notion that the truth depends on private judgment. The Catholic doctrine is, that the Church is the 'pillar' to display the truth, the 'ground' to uphold it; and not a certain arbitrary power, which can create or change the truth at its will, and make truth falsehood, and falsehood truth; virtue vice, and vice virtue. With this caveat we commend the article to our readers, our Low Church brethren in particular."

Where did the editor of the *Churchman* discover the *Roman fallacy* to which he here alludes? What Catholic theologian, what council, what authorized book of instruction contains the doctrine that "truth is *dependent* on the authority of the Church?" We admit this to be a fallacy, and until the *Churchman* adduce the grounds on which he imputes it to the Catholic Church, his readers have a right to consider it, as we now pronounce it, a sheer misrepresentation. The Church is the mere *witness* of the truth revealed by Christ, and contained in the word of God written and unwritten, or scripture and tradition. Far from believing herself invested with "a certain arbitrary power, which can create or change the truth at its will, and make truth falsehood and falsehood truth," she has done every thing in her power, as Bossuet observes, "to tie up her own hands, and deprive herself of the only means of innovation; declaring by all her councils and by all her professions of faith, that she receives no dogma whatever that is not conformable to the tradition of all preceding ages."

Challenge of Bishop Hopkins.—Some time since Bishop Hopkins of Vermont challenged Bishop Kenrick to an oral debate on a useless topic; for which and other reasons the latter declined to accept, but offered as an exchange, to meet the bishop of Vermont in a written discussion of the points controverted between Protestants and Catholics, and promised that the articles in defence of the former should appear in the *Herald*, provided those in defence of the latter should find a place in the *Churchman*. Bishop Hopkins has declined this invitatian for the following reasons, which we extract from the *Catholic Advocate* with its remarks upon the subject.

1. "The *Churchman* is published in another diocess. Its columns are devoted to a select variety, suited to the views of its numerous subscribers; and if I had—what I have not—either authority or influence in the matter, I should doubt the propriety of asking its able editor to pledge himself to the insertion of what might become a long and wearisome discussion."

This reason must seem to the candid reader a mere evasion. It does not appear that the bishop has tried to procure the *Churchman* for the publication of this controversy. Has he asked and been denied its columns? There is no proof that he has, and consequently we regard this reason as having no weight whatever. If Bishop Hopkins can do what he boasts, nothing could be more valuable to the *Churchman*, and its numerous subscribers, than his communications.

2. He "objects because an interruption of several weeks must necessarily intervene between the letters of the respective parties."

This objection is of no weight: First, because "several weeks need not necessarily intervene," for the mails are so rapidly transported from point to point, as to bring distant places into close proximity. And secondly, this interruption in the continuity of the argument could easily be prevented by an agreement between the disputants, to interchange a manuscript copy of their letters, and not commence the publication of them, until they had some numbers prepared, when their correspondence should have such advance of the publication, as to avoid all reason for interrupting "the continuity of the argument," as far as the public is concerned.

The third reason of the bishop has some more show of foundation, which is, "that the distance from New York, would prevent his being able to correct his proofs, and expose him to the accidents of frequent misrepresentation." But could he not in New York find some literary friend to protect him from such mischances? We think he could.

We consider, therefore, that Bishop Hopkins has, upon reflection, thought it safe to exhibit that better part of valor, termed discretion, and prudently avoided a discussion in which he would have been foiled.

THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE.—Our readers will be pleased with the following remarks from the *Banner of the Cross* (an Episcopalian journal), in commendation of the moderate and charitable views of a Rev. Mr. Brainerd, a Presbyterian clergyman of Philadelphia, who scouts the fanaticism of his deluded brethren. The sentiments of Mr. Brainerd have been published just in time for the rebuke of the unchristian and anti-social spirit that is beginning to manifest itself in Baltimore.

"'*Our Country safe from Romanism*,' is the title of a sermon delivered at the opening of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, April, 1841, by the Rev. Thomas Brainerd, pastor of the Third Presbyterian church of Philadelphia; with a copy of which we have been politely favored by the author. We have read it with much pleasure, not the least of which was derived from the truly Christian spirit that pervades it. Would that the spiritual Quixotes who in these 'latter days' are so fond of tilting against Romanism, knew as well what it really is, and the right means of opposing it! . . . It may be inferred from the title of the discourse that the preacher has no sympathy with the fears of ultra-Protestant alarmists: its argument is, 'to show that existing causes furnish no ground to fear that Romanism can ever become the prevailing religion of this land.' No; there is far more danger of its falling a prey to Rationalism or Infidelity, which many of the sincere opponents of Popery are unwittingly encouraging in its stead. Which of the two evils is most to be dreaded, an enlightened Christian cannot doubt:—from either, we devoutly pray that our country may be delivered! But if we *must* choose, give us rather Popery, with all its corruptions. 'Is the necessity so urgent,' says Mr. Brainerd, 'that the peace of the city need be put in jeopardy? . . . Is the danger so imminent, that pastors are called upon to intermit their high and heaven-enjoined efforts for the promotion of practical godliness and the salvation of souls, that they may engage in assaults upon Romanism?' These questions will not be much relished by the 'Protestant Association.' By the way, has that celebrated fraternity already descended to the 'tomb of the Capulets,' that we hear of it no more?"

If it has descended to the tomb of the Capulets we sincerely congratulate the city of brotherly love upon its riddance of so anti-republican a nuisance, and we have reason to believe that the slim patronage with which the *League* has commenced its operations in Baltimore promises it a very short-lived and disreputable existence.

A GOOD CONFESSION.—Under this head the *Presbyterian* takes occasion to reproach us with inconsistency: "*The U. States Catholic Magazine*, published in Baltimore, in an able article entitled 'Anecdotes of the Life and Writings of Fenelon,' admits the following remarkable passage: 'The family of Fenelon was no less distinguished by its antiquity than for the figure it has made in history. One of his ancestors was Bertrand de Salignac, Marquis de Fenelon, known as the author of 'Negotiations in England,' when he was ambassador at the court of Elizabeth, and correspondent of poor Mary of Scots. His reply to Charles IX, who wished him to represent to the queen of England the motives for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, will show the independence of his character: 'Sire, were I to attempt to color over this terrible execution, I should consider myself an accomplice in its guilt. Your majesty had better confide the task to those who advised it.'' The writer of the article then remarks, 'We shall have occasion to see that *our* Fenelon inherited the spirit of his ancestor.' Is it possible that a magazine published with the approbation of the 'Most Reverend Archbishop,' commends this language of the Marquis de Fenelon? Does it venture to style it a massacre, in the execution of which there was a guilt from which the marquis shrunk? Are Roman Catholics willing now to say that Pope Gregory XIII was guilty of an impiety, in having a medal struck commemorative of the event, in which an angel is represented as the great murderer? However this may be, we are glad that there are some Roman Catholics who condemn the wholesale butchery of the unoffending Protestants."

The difficulty of the *Presbyterian* will soon vanish, by attention to the following facts, which we quote from Fredet's Modern History, vol. ii, p. 335.

"It is objected that Pope Gregory XIII publicly returned thanks to God on that occasion; but what was the real object of this rejoicing? Charles IX, in order to palliate the shame of his murderous edict against the Parisian Huguenots, wrote to every court in Europe, that, having just detected their horrid plots against his authority and person, he had been fortunate enough to escape from the imminent danger, by putting the conspirators to death without delay. The Pope then, under that impression, rejoiced, not for the death of the supposed traitors, whose

rigorous punishment he on the contrary deplored, but for the preservation of the French monarch and of his kingdom from utter ruin: exactly, as in a case of war and of a signal victory against invaders, public rejoicings would take place, and every sensible person would willingly share in them, not indeed at the blood shed in battle, but at the advantages gained by his country; and who could dare to find a fault in such conduct?"

OBITUARY.

Death of Rev. J. M. Horstman.—The diocess of Cincinnati has sustained a severe loss in the the death of Rev. Mr. Horstman, who departed this life on the 21st of February, in his sixty-fifth year.

At the convent of the Visitation, Georgetown, D. C. on the 9th of March, Sister Mary Xavier (Duke), aged ninety years, thirty-three of which she had lived in that community.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A Treatise on Baptism; with an exhortation to receive it, to which is added a Treatise on Confirmation. By Francis Patrick Kenrick, bishop of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: M. Fithian. 12mo. pp. 261.

We have been honored with a copy of this valuable work from the distinguished author himself, and we hail its appearance as supplying a desideratum that has long been wanted in our popular theology. The treatises on the subject of baptism in our English books of instruction, are far from imparting that adequate knowledge which our circumstances seem to demand. Most other topics in dispute between Catholics and the Protestant sects are extensively discussed in the writings of controversialists, while the important questions connected with the baptismal rite, are but cursorily considered. Surrounded as we are by dissenters who impugn the divine institution of water-baptism, by others who deny its necessity for salvation, and others again who reject the lawfulness of its administration to infants, we have need of a work like that of Dr. Kenrick, to place in the hands of our dissenting brethren, as well as for the thorough information of Catholics themselves. The principal points on which the author dwells, are the necessity of baptism, the lawfulness of baptizing infants and the validity of the various modes of performing the ceremony; and as he treats these questions particularly in connection with the religious systems that prevail in this country, a vast amount of information is elicited, peculiarly interesting to the American reader. The treatise on confirmation, though brief, will be found more satisfactory than those which have been hitherto in circulation. The work may be procured at John Murphy's, 146 Market street, Baltimore.

Manual of Catholic Devotions, throughout the ecclesiastial year, by the Rev. E Damphoux, D. D. Baltimore: John Murphy, 32mo. pp. 512.

The learned author of this little book of devotions has long been favorably known as a contributor to the stock of devotional works; but of all the prayer books that he has given to the public, we consider the Manual just published as the best adapted to general use. Besides the ordinary devotions performed by the pious Christian, it contains copious instructions on the subject of indulgences,—the devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus at length, and a great variety of prayers for particular seasons of the year. As the devotion of the living rosary is becoming very popular, the explanation of it, with a notice of the indulgences which it imparts, might have been appropriately and usefully mentioned after the common rosary. This Manual of Devotions will, we think, have a wide circulation. The matter, and its arrangement, both promise this result, which will be aided, in no small degree, by the beautiful character of its mechanical execution. The copy which we have received from the publisher is illustrated with seven handsome engravings, and we venture to say, is unsurpassed in point of typographical excellence.

Letter from the Earl of Shrewsbury, descriptive of the Estatica of Caldara, and the Addolorata of Capriana. First American, from the last revised London edition. New York: Casserly & Sons, 12mo. pp. 92.

This publication, with which we have been furnished through the politeness of Messrs. Casserly & Sons, is a re-print of the Earl of Shrewsbury's account of the miraculous virgins in the Tyrol, with additional documents, bringing the narrative down to the year 1842. It has been lately most mendaciously asserted in some Protestant papers, that the case of the *Addolorata* had turned out to be a mere imposture: but by reference to our columns of intelligence, the reader will perceive that an official letter from the bishop of Trent, who was consulted upon the subject of this rumor, proves it to be a malicious fabrication. The contents of the Earl's

Letter will be found most interesting, as well as most consoling to the Catholic reader.

A System of Natural Philosophy, designed for the use of schools and Academies, based on the book of science of Mr. J. M. Moffat. By Walter R. Johnson, A. M. Illustrated by more than two hundred engravings. Eighth edition. Philadelphia: E. C. Biddle. 12mo. pp. 473.

This compilation by Professor Johnson is one of the most useful works as a text book, that have come under our notice. It comprises treatises on mechanics, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, acoustics, pyronomics, optics, electricity, galvanism and magnetism, with a synoptical list of questions on each page for the examination of the pupil, and an enumeration of such works as may be consulted by the student for a fuller investigation of the various subjects.

An Elementary Treatise on Chemistry, with other treatises, designed for the use of schools and academies; based on the book of science of Mr. J. M. Moffat. By W. R. Johnson, A. M. Illustrated by more than one hundred engravings. Eighth edition. Philadelphia: E. C. Biddle. 12mo. pp. 478.

The volume with this title, as will be perceived, is arranged on the same plan, and by the same learned compiler, as that which we have just noticed.

A Review of the Controversy between Bishop Whittingham and Mr. Johns, on the claims of Episcopacy. Boston: Thurston & Torry, 8vo. pp. 31.

This pamphlet, for which we are indebted to the kindness of the author, shows conclusively that the Protestant Episcopal Church is guilty, upon her own principles, of schismatical separation from the ancient church. A few pages of it are devoted to a consideration of the doctrine which teaches a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and assuming as a legitimate test of divine truth, the private interpretation of the Bible, (a false assumption), they cannot but exhibit erroneous inferences drawn from inadmissible premises.

Linear Drawing Book designed for the use of schools and practical purposes. By Samuel Smith, professor of drawing in St. Mary's College, Baltimore. Philadelphia: E. C. Biddle. 12mo. pp. 48.

The object of the author in this work, has been to furnish the scholar with a large number of examples for exercise, and in such order as to lead him gradually through all the departments of linear drawing. The skill of Mr. Smith as an artist, and his long and successful experience in the profession which engages his attention, are an ample guarantee that the book which he has published will be found a most valuable work.

Letters and Sketches, with a narrative of a year's residence among the Indian tribes of the Rocky Mountains. By P. J. De Smet, S. J. Philadelphia: M. Fithian. 12mo. pp. 252.

We have only space to mention the reception of this intensely interesting work, which was kindly sent to us by the publisher, and consists of letters from the pen of Father De Smet, missionary among the Indian tribes of the Rocky Mountains. The book is embellished with twelve engravings taken from real life, and illustrative of Indian scenery and manners, and with the symbolic catechism used by the missionaries in the instruction of the savages. It is for sale at John Murphy's, 146 Market street, Baltimore.

EDITORIAL REMARKS.

Our readers will find a rich entertainment in the able essay which commences the present number of the Magazine, and although extended beyond the usual length of the articles that we have published undivided, it will amply repay an attentive perusal.

In introducing the review of Dr. Hook's sermon by the Rev. Mr. Mason, we observed that we commended the article only for the solid reasoning which it contains, hoping that the occasional fondness of the writer for the burlesque would not be misconceived. We trust that a similar view will be taken of such expressions as may appear too harsh.

"The Church," a poetical composition, we must decline publishing.

Since our last issue we have received several valuable papers, for which we present our acknowledgments, and which we promise to lay before our readers in due season. Among them we will mention a review of "Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella," Nos. II and III of "Sketches from British History," consisting of biographical notices of Father Southwell, S. J. and Lady Margaret, mother of Henry VII, "Edict of Nantes," "Discourse on Bishop Dubois," by Rev. John McCaffrey, and an article on the rise and progress of Gothic architecture.

Our leading article in the May number will be a review of the "Zincali," or Gypsies in Spain, from the pen of an accomplished writer, which, with other interesting matter will present a most agreeable *melange* to our readers.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 18610 2

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.